1	STATE OF NEW YORK: NASSAU COUNTY SUPREME COURT: PART 33
2	X THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK,
3	- against - : IND: 1910N-05
4	MARTIN HEIDGEN, SENTENCE
5	: NYSID: 5195576K
6	Defendant. x
7	February 28, 2007
8	262 old country Road Mineola, New York
10	Before:
11	THE HONORABLE ALAN L. HONOROF,
12	Acting Supreme Court Justice.
13	For the People:
14	
15	HON. KATHLEEN RICE District Attorney - Nassau County
16	BY: MAUREEN MCCORMICK, ESQ. Assistant District Attorney
17	Assistant biseriet Accorney
18	For the Defendant:
19	STEPHEN LAMAGNA, ESQ.
20	GREGORY MARTELLO, ESQ. 666 old Country Road
21	Garden City, New York 11530
22	
23	
24	DUEE DRANGON DED
25	BUFF BRANSON, RPR Senior Court Reporter

People v. Heidgen The following case is on for THE CLERK: 1 sentence, the People of the State of New York against 2 Martin Robert Heidgen under Indictment 1910N of 2005. 3 Sir, you are Martin Heidgen? 4 THE DEFENDANT: 5 THE CLERK: Appearances for the defendant, 6 7 please? Stephen LaMagna, 666 old 8 MR. LAMAGNA: Country Road, Garden City, New York. 9 Appearances for the People? THE CLERK: 10 MR. HAYDEN: Robert T. Hayden and Maureen 11 McCormick, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. 13 14 THE CLERK: Do the People wish to be heard before sentence is imposed, and do they have any 15 victim impact statements? 16 17 MS. McCORMICK: Yes, your Honor, the People 18 do wish to be heard, and the Court and defense counsel have been apprised there are eight members of 19 20 the victim's family who request to speak before your Honor this morning. 21 22 THE COURT: Application is granted. May I begin, Judge? 23 MS. McCORMICK: 24 THE COURT: Yes. MS. McCORMICK: Your Honor, on July 2nd, 25

People v. Heidgen

2005, the defendant, a 24-year-old man, engaged in drinking alcohol. No crime in that, Judge. He was in Manhattan. He went to a place called the House of Blues and he started drinking with friends.

The problem began with Mr. Heidgen's choice not to stop, not to stop for a period of almost nine hours. He stayed at the House of Blues, and how much he had to drink is the subject of some questions. He returned to Nassau county, and he continued drinking until nearly two o'clock in the morning.

It's unknown exactly when he left the party on Sandra Lane where he had continued his drinking, but he did leave, and he had been drinking at that party. He had been drinking so much, in fact, your Honor, that in spite of metabolism over nine hours, at the time his blood was tested after this crash, he still had in his system a .28 blood alcohol concentration, .28, three and a half times what is the established legal limit for driving while intoxicated.

There was extensive toxicology testimony in this case that revealed that that .28 was in the area of the defendant still having, still having in his system, 14 drinks.

But that's not what makes this crime the

People v. Heidgen

crime of murder, the crime of murder for which he was charged, the crime of murder for which he was convicted by a jury, who, in spite of allegations of, after the fact, through the interviews conducted by this office, we learned tried desperately to follow the court's instruction and were diligent in their obligations as citizens, an obligation that should be honored.

It was clear from the jury's deliberation.

It was clear from the notes that they sent that they had immediately gone to the heart of the matter, what was the defendant's state of mind.

His state of mind can only be elicited by the facts in this case, Judge, and while I mean no disrespect ever to the people that I serve, I say that this is not a DWI death. That's not what this case is.

This is a case of depravity, and depravity is something different, something more. The law has made that distinction. This defendant's depravity can be seen through his actions.

He had the opportunity to stay where he was.

He was welcome to stay in the home where he was

drinking, and having consumed enough alcohol to be a

.28, he chose, instead, to get in his car and drive

People v. Heidgen

4,375 pounds of steel uncontrolled, in his estimation, although appearing very controlled, down Nassau County streets.

Your Honor, I direct the court to the probation report with respect to this one fact alone where the defendant himself states -- he admitted, however, that part of not staying at the house that he was at was that he did not want to stay there and have to sleep on the floor. He wanted to sleep in his own bed.

His claimed rationale, his claimed reason for endangering the lives of everyone who came across his path, and taking the lives of Katie Flynn and Stan Rabinowitz, of destroying the lives of their community, their family, their extended family, is because he wanted to sleep in his own bed after he consumed enough to be a .28.

Again, Judge, it's not what makes it the murder per se, because the question is what was going on in the defendant's mind, as per Feingold.

.This defendant managed to control, in a deliberate way, operate his motor vehicle without incident for five miles, from the point on Sandra Lane to the point at the Meadowbrook Parkway where he inexplicably, because there's been no testimony about

People v. Heidgen

how, he became turned around and going the wrong way.

But we do know from the series of witnesses beginning with Elizabeth serwin, Joseph Caruso, Mr. weber, Matthew Sussingham, that over a period of at least 2.9 miles, 2.9 miles, this defendant proceeded in the left lane of the southbound Meadowbrook Parkway going north.

He proceeded at highway speeds estimated to be between 60 and 70 miles per hour. He was unwavering. His operation of that motor vehicle was controlled. It was deliberate. He didn't just simply miss a turn and slide off the road because his ability to operate had been substantially affected by alcohol. He maintained that road. He maintained that speed. There was an air of deliberation and of controlling every action this defendant took.

Still, having been faced with any number of warnings that he was going the wrong way, that he was being passed by oncoming headlights, people honking at. him, people blinking their lights at him, people veering suddenly out of the way to avoid being killed themselves, still he continued in that deliberate, controlled operation of his motor vehicle.

Thirteen thousand feet, more than that,

Doctor closson testified about the effects of alcohol

People v. Heidgen

on perception reaction time, and that the most it could be extended to was the outrageous time of five seconds.

This defendant had multiple times, he had every opportunity to proceed to react, to stop, to slow, to get out of the way, and he never took them.

That is what makes this case depraved indifference to human life, because, fudge, there are facts about this case and the way they align with the law that need to be discussed. But before we get to those facts, I would like to talk about the defendant himself and what we know of the defendant himself.

The court has had access to hundreds of hours of telephone calls from the defendant to any number of parties from the jail. The People have not heard them, but the People wish, nonetheless, that the court consider the content of those conversations, the attitude of the defendant, and what we believe has to be a continued lack of remorse because there has been no remorse expressed in this courtroom or out of it.

The People have sent to the court sentencing letters with letters attached, unguarded letters to friends. we ask the court to consider them. we ask the court to consider that when asked by a

People v. Heidgen

friend if he would drink again, he said, yes, but he might not drive though.

Nowhere in the letters that were provided to the court \mathbf{iS} there any remorse expressed or concern for the victims. \mathbf{I} think it is fair to state that it is all about the defendant from the defendant.

The defendant expresses himself as a victim in this case. He continually blames other people. Tracy sodikoff, his friend, is going to be the reason he has to go to jail, not his own behavior, not the choices he made, not the deliberate way he acted. she's going to be responsible.

The victims' families don't like him because they are being lied to by the prosecution. The police are lying. They are conspiring against him. He is the victim in his own mind, but he is only the victim in his own mind, because, in reality, he is nothing, nothing of a victim. He is purely and absolutely the offender.

This man who, after this crash, can be questioned and comes up with movie quotes, who is devising a scheme of lies, who claims in his letters to his friend Josh zigman, which was part of this trial, that he knew we couldn't use -- we couldn't use those statements against him because he claimed

People v. Heidgen

he had never received his Miranda warnings.

That begins a pattern of behavior of believing he can out smart this system, that he's better than this system that. was betrayed throughout the course of this trial. This defendant sat in this courtroom emotionless. Never did he express the slightest sign of remorse, even as he listened to devastated family member after devastated family member describing scenes that no one should ever have to view or hold in their hearts as they will for the rest of their lives.

No, Judge, this man, after causing this crash, was in the hospital being questioned by Investigator Harris, and he said, I thought I was talking myself out of a DWI. He's protecting himself. He thinks he is going to protect his friends from whatever repercussions, but he's not claiming to know that he has seriously injured or killed people in another car.

As I said during summation, and I will say again, protect them from what? Protect them from his own crash, if he had not seriously injured or killed people? I submit to this Court that the series of statements by this defendant back and forth render him incredible.

People v. Heidgen

He claims in letters to friends that he blacked out while driving, and, yet, in his probation report, there are very clear and vivid imagines that he recalls about operating his motor vehicle that night. He suddenly remembers, Judge, that he believes he tried to slow down just before the crash, because that's just as the alcohol hit him, that .28. suddenly things got very wrong.

Now, for the first time, he recalls a car passing him on the right and thought it was strange, but none of his letters say that, none of his statements to the police said that. Now he says he tried to slow down.

In that probation report, Judge, it is astonishing how he focuses on himself, but along the lines of his persistent behavior of trying to beat this system, the court is aware of the behavior of this defendant as it relates to a DNA -- Court ordered DNA test.

The only emotion ever expressed by this defendant was in court the day that your Honor suppressed the blood test, the blood and the blood test results. That was the only time the defendant was seen slightly weeping for joy.

But when the court ordered that the

. 11

People v. Heidgen

defendant submit to a DNA test, instead, this defendant made every attempt to thwart that DNA test, and testimony was provided to your Honor by Mr. Buffalino from the DNA lab that instead of it being a sample, there was additional, a second sample, a majority sample that belonged to another person who turned out to be an inmate with the defendant.

MR. LAMAGNA: Judge, I object to that line of statements for the purposes of this hearing. That is not part of the record.

THE COURT: It was not part of the record, but it is a part of what I am taking into consideration. I am not limited to the record in my determination today. overruled.

MS. MCCORMICK: Part of what needs to be considered in that fact, Judge, is that as the defendant was taken from his cell and brought down for the buccal swab testing, surrounded by officers to make observations and. make sure that everything went well, he smugly turned to Trooper Harris and said, I'm watching you guys.

The clear implication is that he was trying to beat them again, first by believing that he could get around the statement by his claim that Miranda

himself.

-People v.Heidgen wasn't given to him, and, now, again, by thwarting the test. Your Honor, in the defendant's probation report it has to be noted that the defendant feels that he has -- the way he has been portrayed in the

media is hurtful. His concern, again, goes to

There are other items that must be considered by this court in terms of the defendant's character. While it is true and it is reported in the defendant's probation report that he had been stopped for suspicion of driving while intoxicated and was acquitted, he was found not guilty in a bench trial, the police report relating to that incident indicates that he had the smell of alcoholic beverage --

MR. LAMAGNA: objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sustained.

MS. MCCORMICK: Your Honor, the defendant on a prior occasion was given the opportunity to take a breath test and refused that opportunity resulting in the suspension of his license --

MR. LAMAGNA: Objection.

MS. McCORMICK: -- in Arkansas.

THE COURT: Overruled.

People v.Heidgen

MS. McCORMICK: The defendant, in saying that he is offended by the portrayal of him in the media states: They don't know me. Heidgen stated that his character is immutable and maintained that one foolish or reckless or negligent act doesn't define me.

He concludes his statement, unbelievably, with a statement that somehow, he hopes that somehow he can live with the fact he is responsible for the death of these two people, which he finally mentions, and he says that somehow, his final words, I can smile again like I used to.

Your Honor, he has robbed the smiles, he has robbed the life, not just of the two people he killed, but of countless others who are affected by their deaths, and still his final thoughts are that he be able to smile again.

There is a distinction in the law, your

Honor, between a person who is depraved and a person
who is reckless or -- I hesitate to say the words
simply reckless because I always worry that that will
somehow minimize to the victims of reckless criminals
the acts of their crimes.

This defendant starts with being reckless, but he elevates his own activity to depravity. There

People v. Heidgen

is a distinction in the same way between the words accident, which were used frequently throughout this trial, and a preventable crime.

The word accident could consume anything from a child knocking over a glass of milk to something as horrific as this where the results, though unintended,. were absolutely avoidable and preventable.

There is a distinction in the law, Judge, between the definition of intoxication provided by People v. Cruz which says that the driver has voluntarily consumed alcohol to the extent that he is incapable of employing the physical and mental ability he is expected to possess in order to operate a vehicle as a reasonable and prudent driver.

A reasonable and prudent driver is something substantially different than a person who has intentionally blinded themselves, who has effectively put a blindfold on and chosen to get behind the wheel of a four thousand pound missile through our streets.

There are only two ways to interpret the facts before your Honor. This defendant was aware of where he was. This defendant, in the state that he was in, for the evidence that your Honor heard about the condition of his life, and the fact that he left

People v. Heidgen

that party without saying good-bye to anyone, found himself, whether intentionally or otherwise, going the wrong way and simply said, tough, I'm going for it.

Everything about his behavior indicates that he was operating that car in a deliberate and controlled manner, and if that's what he did, and only he knows what he did, if that's what his mind set was at that moment, that can be considered nothing but depraved, and I would submit everything about these facts and the way he operated that car says that's exactly what he did. He was one exit away from the one he had to take to get home, and he was just going for it.

But, fudge, for argument's sake, if this defendant had actually, as claimed originally in the black-out contention, if he rendered himself, not substantially affected in his ability to operate a motor vehicle, but blind, selectivity blind -- and it has to be selectivity blind because he manages to maintain the curves of the roadway, maintained his speed. He doesn't slide off. If he has truly blinded himself with alcohol, if he has truly rendered himself oblivious, he could not have maintained this road the way he did.

People v. Heidgen

But, if he had, if that's the contention, blinding yourself, not drinking to the point of intoxication, not being .09 or a ten, and not taking the turn properly, turning wide, maybe striking another car, if you have rendered yourself in a position that you can actually travel three miles the wrong way and not be aware of it, and you, nonetheless, got in your car and tried to drive home, that too is an utter disregard for human life. It is deprayed.

The jury, in its wisdom, found so. The jury, in its wisdom considered, all of these facts for five days.

This is a result oriented crime, Judge.

Because the defendant did not target particular victims, the randomness of his victims is one of the things that plays into how he should be sentenced. when he put into motion these depraved — the depraved mind and the acts that resulted in these horrific deaths and injuries, he had no idea how many people could suffer as a result of his behavior.

The very breadth of the risk that he took is something that has to be considered by this Court, because the fact of the matter is that had the defendant been able to have been stopped prior to the

People v. Heidgen

crash occurring, these same actions committed by the defendant would have resulted in a charge of reckless endangerment.

It is the fact that he killed these people that elevates this case to murder. It is the result that not only changes the charge, but the results themselves must be considered in effecting a fair sentence for this defendant, and his results are unspeakable.

His results caused a mother to hold her child's head in her hands. His results caused the death of Stanley Rabinowitz.

The irony in this should not be lost on anyone. Stanley Rabinowitz was a man who drove a limousine and volunteered his time to see that drunk drivers got home free of charge. Stanley Rabinowitz was a man who was operating a limousine from a wedding in which the Flynns and the Tagneys went from the most beautiful day, the most celebratory day in their lives.

The court has seen the photographs from that day. The Court observed for itself, as did all of the other jurors, that in the back of the limousine, the shells that the children collected and are pictured in the photographs given to the court, are

People v. Heidgen

still in the back of that limousine. The Court observed Mr. Rabinowitz's eye glasses are still embedded in the windshield of that limousine.

The Flynns and the Tagneys did everything right. They attended a wedding. They celebrated with their family. They have beautiful family photographs. What should have been perfect memories of a perfect day were destroyed after they acquired a limousine so as not to take any risks of being tired or having consumed any alcohol.

They were doing everything right, and this defendant who did everything wrong, everything wrong, stole from them the most precious things in their lives, and they will never be the same. The concept that time heals all wounds is a lie, and it cannot be said to these families.

Judge, I need to point out, from the probation report, the astute observations of the probation officer who says that one sentence, however, that any limited expressions of remorse from the defendant may be more about regret for his own life which is in ruins than a heart felt reflection of remorse for the victims' losses.

The victims' losses are the results of this crime. The victims' losses, and the fact that two

People v. Heidgen

lives were taken, three lives' physical health destroyed, and countless others' emotional health.

Judge, it has to be pointed out that the entire Flynn family were coming home from that wedding down that route, down the Meadowbrook. The first person who responded to that crash was the victim's great uncle. He saw his brother, that young child's cousin, Gracie and Katie's cousin, arrived on that scene to see that family decimated after just having celebrated with them.

This charge, because it does not specify its victims, must also include an assessment of the results, and, at this time, your Honor, the People who can convey those results better than I will ever be able to are the victims' families, and I ask them to come and make their statements, but only after we beg the court that justice demands, for the character of this defendant, for his behavior, for his lack of remorse, for the fact that he still doesn't get it, for the damage he's done and the extreme nature of his depravity, that this defendant be sentenced to 25 years to life.

At this time, your Honor, the People would ask that Nolan Rabinowitz come up.

MR. N. RABINOWITZ: Thank you, your Honor,

People v. Heidgen for your understanding, your patience, and your 1 attention. 2 My name is Nolan Rabinowitz. I'm Stanley 3 Rabinowitz' youngest son. 4 My father was 59 years --Take your time, Mr. Rabinowitz. THE COURT: 6 With the court's permission, MS. McCORMICK: 7 may I stand with the victim? 8 Yes. 9 THE COURT: Thank you. MS. MCCORMICK: 10 MR. N. RABINOWITZ: My father was 59 years 11 old when he was killed, just at the age of 12 retirement, and just a short time after getting 13 married. 14 He was taken away from me way before his 15 He wasn't here for me during my sudden divorce time. 16 17 this year when I really needed him. He won't be here for my next wedding. 18 My future children will never have the 19 pleasure of knowing firsthand their grandfather's 20 21 smile or gentle ways. Now they will only know my 22 father through stories, like past presidents in 23 history books. Like tragic history-book stories, 24 they will know that he was killed on July the 2nd,

2005, and they will know about this trial.

25

People v. Heidgen

Another way my children will know their grandfather is in the way in which I will raise them, my father as my guide.

when my son is eight years old and he is interested in helping me build a shed, I will teach him everything I know about shed billing and give him a piece of wood and a nail.

when my son is twelve years old, when that shed project has now turned into a three-tiered deck with support for a hot tub, I'II show him how and why I designed it the way I did, and we'll build it side by side, because I know that, if he is as interested in it as I was, he will remember every detail about the project down to how many post holes we dug and how much concrete is used to support each post.

I'II' be the type of father that hands my son the power tools and, after a little instruction, says, here, now it's your turn.

Every year I'II make sure to plan a family vacation and expose my son to sites like the giant sequoia trees in California and the alligators in the Everglades.

when my son is thirteen years old, I'II' be a the father who not only agrees to but offers to take my son and his friends to the roller rink every week,

People v. Heidgen

because maybe this Friday night will be the night when he gets the opportunity to skate holding hands with the cutest girl in his class.

I will be the father that would either prefer to pick him up, no matter how late, to insure that he and his friends get home safely, and driving will never be an issue.

when my son is fifteen years old, no matter how embarrassing the situation may be, I'll try to understand the influences he may be under and seriously ask him if protection is needed for his new girlfriend.

I will ask him this because I love him and I want to protect him and I want the best for his future and not because I think he will remember this conversation for the rest of his life.

This is the best that I can do, and because of the actions of one person, two innocent peoples' lives have been killed, and countless lives have been horribly and unforgivably impacted. The convicted individual that caused this deserves no less than the maximum time away from society.

Your Honor, thank you very much for listening and understanding.

THE COURT: You are welcome.

People V. Heidgen

MS. McCORMICK: Your Honor, at this time the mother of Mr. Rabinowitz's children, Joyce Rabinowitz, would like to make a statement.

MRS. J. RABINOWITZ: Judge Honorof, I want you to know that Stanley Rabinowitz was a good man. I don't say those words without facts to back them up. He only spoke well of someone or he didn't say anything at all.

Stan was always there to lend a helping hand to anyone, a neighbor, a stranger, a friend, his sons, me.

Stan worked his entire life from the time he was just a boy. He deserved a chance to live to a ripe old age and enjoy the fruits of his labor. He deserved the right he had to walk down the aisle at the wedding of his son, Keith, which was last August when he married Bonnie as planned.

He deserved the right he had to meet and play with his grandchildren, to enjoy his new marriage, to collect social security, and to ultimately retire.

Some people may say what impact could Stan's death have on me. After all, we were divorced for a number of years. was he a part of my life? But the truth of the matter is, he has always been a part of

People v. Heidgen

my life. we were going steady when I was fourteen years old. He was at my junior high school graduation. The week before he was killed, we sat together at our son's engagement party. we hugged each other each time we saw one another. We cared about each other. I always wanted stan to be happy, whether we were married or not.

with Stan gone, there is a void in my sons' lives that I try my best to fill, but I know I can't. I am not stan. I am not their father.

Since losing stan, my family has cried a million tears. We have had sleepless nights and we have suffered beyond comprehension. I personally have had anxiety problems driving on the highway, and each day as I go to work, I relive Stan's last moments remembering the video again and again.

I refuse to go out in any situations where I would have to drive home after midnight since that is usually a time when drunk drivers are on the road. I have had flair ups with skin disorders and nervousness as a result of the defendant and the trial that he has put us through.

My children comment to me that I worry about everything, and I guess that has become a reality for me. I have had stomach disorders, probably because I

People v. Heidgen

now realize that people like this defendant can be so callous and show no remorse for their actions even when their actions cause death.

Even his family members are so self-centered that they care nothing for the victims here. They have made statements to the press that this defendant is a scape goat and a victim of a political plot against him. It is just unbelievable that people can be that cruel.

My feelings and anguish also encompass the suffering of the Flynn and Tangney family. Hearing the testimony at trial and the descriptions of their injuries and the operations they have endured resound in my head often. I cry for them and their loss of that beautiful child, Katie. Many tears have been shed by my family for their suffering.

I respectfully request that your Honor make the proper and warranted decision in this matter.

Martin Heidgen did heinous crimes against the people of this state and against my family and the Flynn and Tangney family.

He knew exactly what he was doing. He did it purposefully. He proved the kind of man he is that day, as he did in court when he was ordered to have a DNA test done.

22.

People v. Heidgen

Your Honor advised the defendant's attorney that his client came to court with dirty hands, but the defendant actually showed us his dirty mouth and deviousness and untrustworthiness. Martin Heidgen deserves the maximum sentence of 25 years to life in prison.

unfortunately, we cannot bring Stanley and Katie back to us, but we can prevent him from doing this again to others. we must protect the public from this unremorseful and dangerous man. Thank you.

THE COURT: You are welcome.

MS. MCCORMICK: Your Honor, Keith Rabinowitz would like to speak now, his first son.

I have been corrected, his second son.

MR. K. RABINOWITZ: Your Honor, my father was a very honest and decent man. His friends loved him for the person he was, not for what he had or owned.

He was the type of person who his friends and family could always count on. His opinion on any matter was always held i.n the utmost regard by all of his friends and family. He would say, if you don't have anything good to say, don't say anything at all.

My father was only thirteen when he lost his father to Parkinson disease. He quickly became the

People V. Heidgen

man of the house, working to help support the household. He learned responsibility at a very young age, and he did anything and everything he could to better himself and his family.

He was a very sensible, wise and level headed, safety minded and cautious person. When we would go out on the boat, he would have everybody sit still and listen to him giving the rules of the boat, what to do and not to do, and made sure everyone understood them. He knew it was his responsibility to protect his passengers and guests, which he always took very seriously. He genuinely cared about people and would help anyone in need to the best of his ability.

My father took pride in everything he did and gave a hundred -- a hundred and ten percent in all that he did and taught me and my brother to do the same.

when he had a pick up to do when he was driving, he took a little extra time to make sure that everything went right. He would put a smile on his face to make people feel good.

The night of the crash some of the other drivers were arguing about the trip to Long Beach, and it was him who came forward and who volunteered

:9

People V. Heidgen

to drive, maybe not because he wanted to, but because it was the right thing to do.

My father really was my best friend. He was the first person I would call to talk to about anything, good or bad, and I held his opinion in the highest regard.

when he was married to Rita in October of '04, I was honored and happy to sign his marriage certificate because I knew it would make him happy, and making him happy was the most important thing to me.

when I met Bonnie, my dad was the first person I called. I said, Dad, I think I met the one. My father's relationship with Bonnie grew very strong and they came to love and respect each other very much. They got along very well, sometimes talking on the phone for hours. He was always welcome over at our house, and we always encouraged him to stop by any time.

when it was time for me to propose to Bonnie, my father and I planned out the surprise together. I told him how honored I was that he was part of the surprise, and we both felt very good about that. He was very happy. I told him we wanted to have kids and start our family and that one of the

People v. Heidgen

reasons for this was to give him grandchildren. He was very excited that she would be part of our family, the future for us, grandchildren, and his future.

My father always told me to watch out for the other guy and be careful on the road between 1:00 a.m. and the morning. My father was a guy who would give someone who had been drinking too much a ride home for free.

Martin Heidgen never showed any remorse toward me or my family at any time through this trial or at any time. He seems to think that he is the victim in this, and he has refused to take responsibility for his actions.

Anyone playing chicken on the wrong side of the road without care of anyone's life, including their own, doesn't deserve to live. I can't even fathom that someone who has seen so much pain and horror seems not to even care about any of the pain they caused.

unfortunately, our state does not believe in the death penalty in this case, and we are forced to concur with the sentence imposed on him by you. That is why I ask of you to impose the maximum sentence allowable by law. Thank you.

People v. Heidgen

THE COURT: You are welcome.

MS. McCORMICK: Your Honor, the next victim to speak is Rita Rabinowitz, Stanley Rabinowitz' new wife. They had not yet had their first anniversary.

MRS. R. RABINOWITZ: Martin Heidgen, due to your selfishness and wanton lack of concern for human life, you took the life of Stanley Rabinowitz and Katie Flynn. Katie hadn't begun to live yet, and Stan, who was so full of life, had his cut short by your senseless act of murder.

Stan Rabinowitz was a strong man, yet gentle and tender. People were drawn to him because of his personality, crazy sense of humor, honesty, kindness and wisdom. He was a wonderful husband, father, grandfather and friend. He had a big heart and loved easily.

He was my oasis in the desert, my bright and shining star, and he taught me to love again. we loved our life together and had wonderful plans for the future. All that was ripped away from us by you on July 2nd, 2005, in the early hours of the morning.

we had only been married for nine months.

There is a hole in my heart that will never be filled. You killed my soul mate, best friend and the love of my life. Stan was truly my gift.

People v. Heidgen

Your Honor, I respectfully request that you sentence martin Heidgen to the maximum that the law allows. Twenty-five years to life will never bring Stan back to me, but martin Heidgen will be in a place where he cannot kill anyone else while driving drunk or break hearts ever again. Thank you.

THE COURT: You are welcome.

MS. McCORMICK: Your Honor, before I introduce the members of the Flynn family, I will ask the Court to bear in mind, in consideration of sentencing, the eight-inch binder of letters and petitions and photographs that have been submitted by the Flynn family as well as the number of letters from the Rabinowitz family and friends.

Your Honor, at this time, the first speaker from the Flynn and Tangney families will be Christopher Tangney.

THE COURT: Mr. Tangney, will you be able to stand for this, or would you like to sit down?

MR. C. TANGNEY: No, I'm fine. Thank you.

Your Honor, thank you for this opportunity to address the court.

Thank you, Maureen and Bob, for your compassion and help on this trial.

My family has suffered irreparable damage

People v. Heidgen

inflicted by martin Heidgen. Everything that has happened, Stanley's death, Katie's death, Neil's injuries, henna's injuries, Denise's injuries, Gracie's injuries and my injuries, were all set in motion by the choice that evil Marty made.

Martin Heidgen, like Charles Manson, has lured Stevie and Greg to believe he is the victim. He is not. I am. My family is. we, as a people, as a society, are. We are the victims, not just my family, the Rabinowitzes, but all of us. We, as a people, have a right to be safe and comfortable when moving about on the roadways.

During this trial Stevie and Greg have distorted the facts and outright lied. They have portrayed evil Marty as a victim. He is anything but. He has lied to the police. He has lied to his friends. He has lied to his family. He was caught polluting court directed tests. He has tampered with evidence to the degree of taking another man in his mouth to foil a court ordered DNA test.

Stevie, in his opening statement, said that Marty was innocent but should pay for his crimes. At no time has the defense team come forward with a plea. They have gone out of their way to delay, confuse and lengthen this trial and confuse the jury.

.20

People V. Heidgen

The conduct of the defense team was appalling. Stevie's incessant clicking of his pen while miss McCormick was on direct, his animated gestures and arm waiving in the presence of the jury while miss McCormick's and Mr. Hayden's backs were turned, these acts were childlike and unprofessional.

Denise was on the stand giving testimony a short time when Greg accused her of -- and the charges -- of being politically motivated, inferring that the charges were not warranted.

Greg inferred the charges were some campaign agenda of Kathleen Rice when, in fact, he knew the indictment and charges were at the direction of then DA Denis Dillon. This was another deception.

My family, the Rabinowitzes, society, we all deserve justice. I mean, we are the victims here. we did nothing wrong.

Your Honor, as a judge, you look at the reports, the clinical police, medical records of events. You impose a sentence on the jury's verdict. when you impose that sentence, you are to be impartial.

when you look at us, you don't see or hear my wife whimpering every night in her sleep from the pain, and you don't see the lack of Neil's, Denise's,

J

People v. Heidgen

and my ability to move, to get dressed in the morning, our limited abilities caused by evil Marty. You don't see an athlete, a 37-year-old father, unable to pick up his children. He can't chase after them, wrestle or roughhouse with them. This is a two year old, a four year old, and a six year old who should not have been robbed of a father's roughhousing.

You don't see Lisa, a newlywed, apologizing to me hundreds of times over the past year for having a wedding so far away. she did nothing wrong to deserve this guilt. She got married.

You don't see Denise,]enna and me cry every day.

You did not see me avoid Neil for over a year, not talk to him, not get caught alone in a room with him, for fear I would look at him, because he looked so much like Katie.

You don't see a family that at one time spent every holiday, vacation and weekend together.

Now, one of us, conspicuously and purposely, stays away for fear that we are moving along without Katie.

Your Honor, I don't know how you look at the reports, the various paperwork, the verdict and impose a sentence devoid of emotion, especially with

People v. Heidgen

us sitting right in front of you and in your face a family demanding justice. It is not only us that needs justice and protection but society as well.

when you look at us, we are nothing special. we are everybody. we are the guys in the white hats, just an average family returning home from a wedding.

Your Honor, you must protect us from the evil Martys who choose to act without regard to the rules and the laws of society.

EVII Marty chose to drive drunk that night. He knew what he was doing. He entered into a course of conduct that proves he knew exactly what he was doing. He specifically snuck away from his friends without saying good-bye because he knew they would provide a place for him to stay. He knew that his condition — that in his condition they would intervene and he didn't want the hassle. He chose to leave. He chose to drive and he knew his condition.

He chose to drive, and as he drove, he decided to self-destruct. I don't know exactly when he chose.-to kill. I do know it was decided around 2:00 a.m. on July 2nd, 2005, in the vicinity of the toll plaza on the Meadowbrook Parkway, because that's when an evil Marty decided to kill and kill he did.

His first attempt failed when he tried to

16.

.20

People v. Heidgen

crash into Elizabeth serwin forcing her to the shoulder. she evaded and lived.

His second attempt further north on the Meadowbrook Parkway, while more aggressive, also failed when he tried to crash into Mr. Caruso.

Mr. Caruso had to veer across two lanes on to the shoulder to avoid being killed.

Further north near the Babylon Turnpike, on the third attempt to kill, he was successful. I am the victim of that crash. I am also an eye witness. I witnessed Marty track us. when he changed lanes -- when we changed lanes, he changed. I watched him aim at us. I watched him turn into us at full speed.

Mr. Rabinowitz tried to evade the on coming onslaught. I watched evil Marty crash into us. I watched his truck climb up over the hood of the limo, and I watched as Marty killed and maimed. Your Honor, I watched Marty aim at us with intent and purpose.

Your Honor, you must protect us and you must extract justice for what has happened. The only justice warranted for this evil, evil piece of shit, is that he gets 25 years to life. I seek justice for the acts of Marty Heidgen. Only the maximum is dictated. Thank you.

People v. Heidgen

THE COURT: Before you ask your next victim to speak, \boldsymbol{I} am going to. adjourn these proceedings for about ten minutes.

(whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

THE COURT: Miss McCormick?

MS. MCCORMICK: Your Honor, in listening to Christopher Tangney's statement, before I bring in Denise Tangney, I realized that I neglected to bring something to the court's attention that I think bears on this sentencing.

The court is aware that there had been statements made by one of the defendant's friends, Tracy sodikoff, that the week before this incident the defendant had become intoxicated and had left the party, again, without saying good-bye to anybody, what she believed was an attempt to evade having his keys taken, because, according to all of those friends, it was their practice not to drive, to take the keys and remain where they were.

Your Honor is aware that miss sodikoff made a statement that she confronted the defendant just one week earlier about never doing that again and was given assurances by the defendant that it was a one-time event, an anxiety attack, and that that prompted belief of the proximity of that behavior.

People v. Heidgen

The promises elicited, the fact that he was directly told that it was unacceptable and now the proximity to this event is something that I think the Court should bear in mind in sentencing.

I apologize for leaving that out initially.

Mr. Tangney's statement, since he referred to it, I thought it needed some clarification.

Denise Tangney was a victim and is the grandmother of Katie and she is the next speaker, your Honor.

THE COURT: would you like to sit down.

MRS. D. TANGNEY: No. Thank you.

Judge Honorof, thank you for the opportunity to address this Court.

THE COURT: You are welcome.

MRS. D. TANGNEY: I heard your admonitions to the jury. You told them to be impartial. You told them to stick to the evidence. You told them to separate the facts from sympathetic emotion, and almost as impossible as that is to do now, I'm attempting to address you today from that perspective.

I have tried to compartmentalize our deep scars, our catastrophic losses of our physical and spiritual and our emotional beings, our entire family

People v. Heidgen

unit. i have tried to put that aside for the brief opportunity to speak to you and come to it from a different perspective.

In your decision today, I ask you to consider why there's-so much media here today. why? why?

In determining the sentence for this depraved human being, I ask you to consider why our circumstances, our story, this case, why has it touched so many across the united States, and I've gotten letters from overseas. Why is that?

In my bed for a year and a half, unable to do anything but sit and read and think and pray, I have pondered why you open the paper and every day there's somebody's tragedy in there. Why has our case resonated with so many? why is that?

I believe it's because this depraved individual violated everything that represents right and good. This depraved individual violated a family, our family. He violated loving, interdependence, loving, mutual support, violated loving, customs, joy, loving, responsibility.

we did everything right that night, and we had every right as citizens to expect to travel on a public highway and expect to tuck in four children in

People v. Heidgen

bed that night.

why are they here? why is the media here?

Because we are everybody. We are every man. our

face is everybody's face. We are every mother. we

are every father. we are every grandparent. we are

every family.

Interdependence, mutual support, customs, joy, responsibility, doesn't that describe the tenant of a healthy society? Aren't laws meant to protect the very fabric of a civilized society? Isn't that why we are here today? Isn't that why you and everybody else that works in this building gets up in the morning?

It's 2007 but the premises is primal to me. society has rules. It has rules to protect it's integrity, and, since the age of the caveman, if an individual violated the integrity of the group, they were shunned and they are were ostracized. why? To protect the group, and living in this group and reaping the benefits of this group demands responsibility.

in this day and age, you want to abandon your kids, you want to shave your head, you just go to rehab. You extort money, forfeit public trust, you say you are sorry and then you go to rehab.

People v. Heidgen

Today, your Honor, your decision has the opportunity to tell this depraved individual, and those who are like him, that this court will not tolerate a laisez-faire attitude towards social responsibility.

This pathetic, depraved individual chose to live outside the boundaries of social and lawful conduct. My family and the Rabinowitz' family are the victims of that choice.

My comments today are addressed to you and to lady justice who is blind to all the emotions and everything except for the facts, and the fact is that Neil, Chris and I were brutally assaulted. The fact is that we lost our Kate to murder.

In the midst of this whole time, we can't lose sight that we have lost our little girl. She's not a cause. she's not a social agenda. she's our baby and the light of our life. she's the glue that keeps our family family. she is pure joy, and we are poorer for her absence.

Jenna and Neil will parentdifferently.

Neil will practice law differently. They will interact with the world around them differently void of her absence.

Her sister and her brother are going to grow

People V. Heidgen up differently, void of her loving influence. Her friends, her school, Long Beach, anyone and any person that she was supposed to touch in her life are poorer for her absence. This depraved individual is responsible for This depraved individual must take that. responsibility for the way he chose to live his life. This court has the responsibility to demand responsibility from this person and from its citizens. Judge, I request the maximum sentence for two murders. Thank you. THE COURT: You are welcome.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

each count charged against him, three assaults and

MS. McCORMICK: The next speaker is Jennifer Flynn.

MRS. FLYNN: I loathed standing before you today knowing that I am expected to sum up the impact of the crash in a statement. It cannot be done, but I stand before you because no one should live like I do.

I am here for Grace, Eamon, Colm, for my family, friends, neighbors and for the thousands of people that have been extraordinarily kind to us. It is courage that brings me here, not revenge, because

People v. Heidgen it's the right thing to do.

-20

we, as a society, have allowed drunk driving to continue. Katie didn't die from cancer, cystic fibrosis or some other terrible disease which compels us to send money to a foundation praying that scientists will cure. we donate all we can afford. we raise funds. we pray and hope that someone will come up with a cure. Everyone agrees that these scourges needs to be eradicated.

Drunk driving exists because we allow it to. with drunk driving, you can't just write a check and hope for the best. It requires us to look at how we have been tolerating drunk driving with insufficient jail time, inadequate charges and ridiculous self-improvement classes.

why do we accept laws that are written *IN* such a way that law enforcement must prove someone's state of mind? I have the blood, the confession, the witnesses, the videotape and the unrepentant sociopath driver.

People actually said to me that if he was not convicted of murder, at least he'll get manslaughter and some jail time. Why would I accept that? Why do we accept that?

Kate was murdered needlessly by a deliberate

People V. Heidgen

act. Drunk driving could be dramatically reduced tomorrow if we changed our mind set and punished drunk drivers. It's easy to give jail time. It's easy to stick someone in a program, but it doesn't work.

I wish that I had the opportunity to spend thursday nights in a class somewhere. I wish I had the opportunity to pay a fine. I wish I could spend ten years in jail. By ten years worth of calendars, I would cross every day off, and, at the end, I would get my life back. But my tomorrow will never get better ever.

Drunk driving continues because people aren't afraid not to. Punishments are not that big of a deal. They are not severe enough because society doesn't view it as the crime it should which brings me to the trial.

why do we accept it when the New York Times reports that this is a drunk driving bungle, bungle? Bungle is the word they actually used. Bungle is a' term you should use if you drop a bag of chips or, at worst, roll through a stop sign.

Katie's head was severed from her body. The entire front end was embedded in Stanley Rabinowitz.

To clean it up and water it down so it's more

People v. Heidgen

palatable for the papers and the news, the jury and the defendant is wrong.

setting aside how insulting that is to Kate, Mr. Rabinowitz and our family, it was a disservice to drivers everywhere to not discuss the crash as it actually happened. If it were not constantly watered down, maybe we would punish drunk drivers appropriately.

Maybe if you knew that the crash didn't end on impact, if you knew how things unfolded after impact, people could form an informed opinion on drunk driving.

Two dead, three others maimed in a car accident, as the defense would like to paint this, doesn't even come close to describing the carnage of that night.

The defendant has rights -- and I am a true believer in the system -- but his rights don't supersede mine, and if the decisions are to be made, they should be based on all the facts, and it didn't end on impact and it should count.

who cleans it up for me? who cleans it up for the court officers and police officers who don't even know us and are still visibly affected during their testimony by the horrors of July 2nd, a year

People V. Heidgen

and a half later, or the EMTS and police officers that were not permitted to testify because it would have been prejudicial? who cleans us out of their nightmares?

It should count for sentencing today and people should know so that change might be made and society's tolerance and acceptance of this crime. I shouldn't be dismissed as a grieving mother. What happened to me and Kate should be known and be given the weight it deserves.

I sat with Kate on the Meadowbrook Parkway and calmly and knowingly told officer Collins, the officer stationed to sit with me, that my life was over. There was nothing exaggerated or dramatized in that statement because he drove seventy miles an hour and mowed us down with a head-on crash. I was left to pick up my most beautiful, loving, first born seven-year-old daughter's head off the floor of a limousine, to sit on the ground holding her and watching helplessly those I love in so much pain, to see my father's leg cut off and his body mangled, my husband moaning in pain and screaming for Kate, the unnatural and scary positioning of my mother, the blood and bodily remains strewn on the seats and my helpless, scared five-years-old hurt daughter crying

23

24

25

People v. Heidgen

in the corner.

.2

It sounds flat on paper. I hate saying it out loud, but living it can't be described:

Driving with Kate to the hospital, crying as

I knew I was getting closer and closer, knowing it
was the end, and kissing her good-bye, having minutes
to get it together as I was rolled into an empty
corridor to wait at the opened back entrance of the
ER where I would meet Grace;

How scarey it was to see my baby on a gurney, not knowing how we would make it through the night or any day thereafter, saying good-bye to my father as he was transferred to a hospital better equipped to treat his horrendous injuries, letting him know how much I loved him, how peaceful Kate looked in her sleep, and how she could not have felt any pain;

Calling Neil's mother with the devastating news about Kate and having nothing to say about Neil's condition, how frightening it was to be at the hospital without him, how scared I was for his survival physically and mentally, pleading into friends' answering machines to pick up the phone so they could get to south Nassau Hospital before the state trooper that I was told was sent to tell him

People v. Heidgen

that his daughter was dead, all the secondhand information I was getting about his condition and doubting he was well enough too hear about Kate;

watching the clock minute by minute, waiting for 7:00 a.m. so that my mother could start her first of many surgeries, still not knowing if it was because she wasn't stable enough to be operated on or if the hospital was waiting for the surgical team;

At about 7:00 a.m., the hospital staff realized that Grace was never examined, knowing that she was bleeding internally and would need to be watched for several days in the pediatric intensive care unit, not knowing how much she knew and how much we could tell her.

we spent five days together in the hospital.

As we were discharged, Grace and I sat in a wheel

chair being rolled out to the car when she saw a

newspaper with Kate's picture on the cover. I had to

tell her and the boys by myself when we got out.

we stayed with relatives for a couple of days hoping Neil would be released and that we could go back to my mother's house together. But it would be three weeks before he was released and we needed to get home..

It was two weeks before the doctors released

People v. Heidgen

my parents and my husband, transferring them to a rehabilitation facility and permitting them to go by ambulance to Kate's wake and funeral.

I visited three hospitals a day, comforting my. one year old, three year old, five year old, planned a wake and funeral mass by myself. That should count and that should be weighed. Two dead, others injured is an unfair incomplete depiction of that crash.

After the mass, Neil and I went back to the rehab facility. I had just had a funeral mass for my perfect, spectacular child, and Neil still could not come home with us. Because of his injuries, he slept in a recliner while I slept in his hospital bed, the two of us holding hands for as long as we had the strength to keep them outstretched.

our house was being renovated by my father and the six of us had been staying at my parent's house. Now we had no home to go home to, no one to go with, broken bodies and spirits. Friends, neighbors and strangers came together like an Amish barn raising to build us a place where could try our best to live. We spent four months living in one room, myself and the kids on the bed, Neil in the recliner, and Kate in a small, small cardboard box on

People v. неidgen

a shelf in the closet next to my T-shirts.

night staring at the television. For the first few

He spent all day crying and drinking and all

months, I never spoke in the morning because $oldsymbol{I}$

couldn't believe I had to live another day without

her. For the next few months, I didn't speak in the

evening because I couldn't believe I lived the whole

day without her.

My father came home four weeks after the crash and my mother five and a half weeks after the crash. All of us living in one home wailing from the pain both mental and physical. It was helpful because we needed each other and horrible because it's too hard to be with people you love in that pain and not be able to help each other.

we moved back home the weekend of Kate's birthday. on what should have been Kate's eighth birthday, we brought ashes to the beach, spreading her in the place that once brought her so much joy.

The past year and a half required more surgeries for all of us. The physical and mental pain we lived with could not and should not be referred to and cleaned up as also injured.

I don't want to describe what my life is like, but would it make a difference if you knew how

People V. Heidgen

he ended all of our lives because he could and because he wanted to? would it change the way we view and punish this crime?

The papers cleaned it up. The trial cleaned it up. I put my makeup on and I stay busy with my children, but if you knew that I was half the person that I used to be, would it make a difference? It should.

I spell, count or pray to keep my mind from going to where it's difficult to come back from. The crash and living without her affects every τv show I watch, every book I read, every conversation I have, every activity I engage in and all the relationships I have.

Food, drugs, alcohol and exercise do not provide respite. I gasp for air as I walk through the aisles of waldbaum's. I get so overwhelmed with grief or gratitude when I meet the people who are so kind to us that I can't speak. I fumble over my words and I am reduced to tears in a second.

i try to be the best mother, wife, daughter and friend that I am or can be, but I'm half the woman I was. I am most happy when I'm with my children. Yet being with them makes me want them more. I had four kids in six years. we didn't have

People v. Heidgen

a chance to grow as individuals yet. we were one unit, each piece making up one personality. Her absence is palpable.

My marriage has suffered. I have loved my husband since I was seventeen. But it is excruciatingly difficult to be with someone in that much pain and to feel the same way and not be able to do anything about it.

I am quiet, disconnected and withdrawn. There is no conversation that follows what happened to us. There is no subject worth talking about, so I don't.

My friends and family mark the loss of Katie and us. we are trying. I spend time with relatives. I wake up with a rash. I go to a birthday party or holiday. I wake up with an infection. I sat through the trial coughing and sneezing.

Living with the stress makes me physically ill. I have suffered from infections, headaches, back pain, cuts and colds that take an inordinate amount of time to heal. I can't sleep: I'm incredibly sad. I wonder what we are doing here, and I hope that heaven is everything I want it to be.

we are a good, strong people, a loving family with close friends living in a great community

People v. Heidgen

and every day is a struggle, a
can't-get-the-door-open air-on-my-face-fast-enough
struggle.

If people knew all of this, would it make a difference in the way that we punish drunk drivers? would it force a remedy for the inadequacy of the current system?

It doesn't end with two dead, others injured. It's not that neat. Although time will make us more resilient as we learn to live this new life, it will never be good. How we live to get there should count for sentencing and be known so that changes can be made.

Living without Kate is more difficult that I can or care to convey, but the manner in which she was stolen leaves my breathless. One man chose to end her life.

The murder charges, correctly chosen because it fits the crime, were submitted under Denis Dillon, the previous DA. . The current DA prosecuted the case. By reporting the defense's claim that this charge was brought by Kathleen Rice's political motivation, without adding that it was actually her predecessor who brought the charge, is wrong.

This is not about political agendas. It is

/"

People v. Heidgen

not about Kathleen Rice. It is about Katherine Marie Flynn. It is about Stanley Rabinowitz. The charge of depraved indifference murder was chosen because it fit the crime committed.

His reptilian attorneys misled the jury and the public with complaints that the charge was tantamount to intentional murder when he was only charged with depraved indifference murder. where is the follow-up statement that challenges him on his blatant lies? How can we ever have a necessary dialogue if the public thinks that we are crazy grieving parents and that this is a political witch hunt?

If Newsday is going to go print articles with three defense attorneys or liberal law professors who state we'll never win, where are the three retired prosecutors that counterbalance that pathetically wrong drivel?

I am not saying you have to give the victims preferential treatment, but be fair. How does it serve the public if we are led to believe that this is a battle that can't be won?

our crash fits the new appellate rulings perfectly. who else would have the videotape, the number of witnesses, sympathetic victims? why are we

:21

People v. Heidgen

writing the laws in such a way that it makes prosecuting these cases so difficult? why do we tolerate it? why is it not discussed in detail?

we give the media the perfect vehicle to put this dialogue out there. We all drive on the same roads and the focus should be on changing the system.

His foul, disgusting defense attorneys have lied about how remorseful this murderer is. we know he isn't sorry because he tried to have his blood thrown out. He tried to beat the DNA test. He allowed a strategy based blatantly on false distances and speed. He showed not a scintilla of remorse throughout the entire trial.

we know he isn't sorry from the letters he wrote from prison. We know from the court officers who took him to and from the courtroom. We know from the correction officers who take him to the law library where he researches his appeal. He never grieves. He is not sad. He never mentions us. He is only concerned with himself. The remorse would not make him less guilty, but it would make him human.

I request that he receive the maximum sentence available. He drove such an incredible long distance the wrong way. It's the entire length of

People V. Heidgen

our boardwalk. To go that far and pass all those people and never break or turn when on his side of the road before the overpass are wide areas of grass on both sides. He aimed his truck right at us and plowed into us at a crushingly high speed.

He stole her life. He ended ours. I request that he be sentenced to 25 years to life. It is not out of revenge. I take no pleasure in knowing he'll be serving that length of time. I will not be soliciting convicts to have him beaten weekly.

I almost never think of him because he's in jail, and that is the way it's supposed to be. He should serve 25 years to life because it is the correct punishment for the crimes committed. Life is worth that, Kate's life, Stanley Rabinowitz' life and our lives.

Thank you for taking the time to read the binder. I hope it was considered, and thank you for fairness throughout the trial and the opportunity to be heard here today.

THE COURT: You are welcome.

MS. MCCORMICK: Your Honor, Neil Flynn.

THE COURT: Mr. Flynn, as you know, I read the letter you sent me personally. would you prefer to sit down for this?

People v. Heidgen

MR. N. FLYNN: No, your Honor.

Good morning, your Honor, M. Hayden, miss McCormick.

There are two tangential but important issues I am going to deal with before the bulk of my remarks.

The first is the reprehensible behavior of the defense attorneys who were under the direction and control of this defendant. while you may have convinced yourselves that you were engaged in ethical, even laudatory efforts to defend the rights of this filthy child killer against the over charge of murder, your dishonest, unethical behavior throughout the proceedings belies that contention.

From the very outset it was clear that the truth would have no influence on your presentation, thus undermining whatever tenuous claim you might have otherwise made to acting honorably in a distasteful cause.

when, at the suppression hearing, you produced that unethical quack to bolster your unsupported allegations of police and prosecutorial impropriety, it was clear that you would stoop to any level to free this filthy killer from justice.

without any facts to support your

People V. Heidgen

contentions, you recklessly slandered the police and the prosecution inventing wild claims of evidence tampering, conspiracy and perjury. Your willingness to slander hard working, honest people to protect the interest of a filthy child killer remain consistent throughout the trial and continues to date.

You lied repeatedly to the jury, to the Court and to the public regarding the provenance of the blood sample. Incredibly, you repeated these lies even after that filthy killer drank another criminal's juices in a desperate attempt to escape justice.

Even after it was clear to everyone that he knew the blood was his and that its contents were damning, you were perfectly willing to take advantage of the jury's ignorance and lie to their faces. Your glib willingness to lie over and over again on behalf of a filthy child killer was, unbelievably enough, not the most disgusting aspect of your performance.

It wasn't even your habit of patting him on the back or rubbing his shoulders in a feigned effort to revive his spirits despite his absolute lack of remorse or emotional response for the horrors he had reaped, no, the absolute low point was, when questioning the medical examiner about my daughter's

People v. Heidgen

death, you actually stood not 20 feet away from my wife and 1 and blamed us for killing our daughter by failing to put a seat belt on her, when you knew we had and that your client used that very seat belt to cut her head off. I knew by then that you were unethical liars, but I did not know what absolute low lives you really were until you blamed me for killing my own daughter.

You continue -- you can continue to lie to anyone stupid enough to listen and pretend you were simply taking on an unpleasant but necessary task in defending this filthy child killer, but everyone who saw you lie day in an,d day out, and everyone who saw you blame us for our daughter's death, knows that there is no puss filled sink hole that you wouldn't swim in order to garner the publicity and thereby the money that a successful defense would bring you. say what you want, but you and I both know that you are just whores.

As for you, you greasy little boot ticker, everything I just said holds true for you as well. You should feel obliged to tell every potential client you were sick day they taught cross-examination at law school. You are not an accident reconstruction expert, are you (gesturing)?

People v. Heidgen

As for you, you filthy child killer, you are utterly beneath me, my wife and my daughter's memories, so I won't waste much time on you. I just want you to know two things.

understand, you and I aren't through, not by a damn sight. So you better make the most of your time in prison because that's as good as it gets for you from here on out.

second, nobody in this room gives a damn if you are sorry, most of all because it doesn't matter. Neither my family nor I would care even if you were truly repentant. What you did can never be overcome.

But the fact is, you aren't the least. bit sorry. Everyone who has paid any attention can tell that you couldn't care less that you cut my little girl's head off and forced my wife to hold her lifeless daughter in her arms for hours.

So whatever empty claims of apology you plan to make will fall on deaf ears. But, if you do bother to beg for mercy, be advised, do not mention my daughter or my family. I will not allow you to use us in your filthy charade.

Your Honor, in that regard, \mathbf{I} urge you to disregard anything he might say out of hand, not allow him to make a further mockery of these

People v. Heidgen

proceedings. He has done contortions to deceive this Court without regard to the institution of justice or the truth. Do not countenance his request for mercy because he is unworthy, and do not believe his false pleas of apology or sorrow.

In addition to this Statement, I have submitted a letter to Judge Honorof because I do not intend to reveal the true depths of my family's suffering in open court. I have made this decision, not because I am embarrassed or ashamed, but simply because I do not wish to give the defendant the satisfaction of hearing the full extent of the pain he has caused us.

I believe he would revel in hearing of our true suffering because he is an immoral sociopath. I believe this because, as the videotape clearly shows, he intentionally rammed our limousine and because he clearly believes himself to be the aggrieved party in these proceedings.

His disregard for the lives of innocent strangers was manifested in his behavior on that night, and his disregard for the rules of decent society have been manifest every day since.

From the outset it was clear that this was not a DWI involving homicide. It was a multiple

People v. Heidgen

murder committed by a depraved killer who happened to be drunk. when you look at the evidence, this conclusion is inescapable.

From his concern only for his truck to his, by his own admission, hideously contrived, calculated statement to Investigators Harris and Baez, to his self-absorbed correspondence to his friends, to his constant complaints to his jailers and fellow criminals, to his attempt to beat the DNA test, to his absolute lack of emotional response to the most compelling testimony regarding his crimes, all of this clearly points to an evil, narcissistic personality, not simply someone who had too much to drink and made bad decisions.

Whether you accept this premise is immaterial since intent is not an issue, and, in the event the results of his actions were so devastating to so many people, he must receive the maximum punishment available. Anything less would be an affront to the memories of Katie and Stanley and to our families as well as a rebuke to society in general which has finally awoken to the horrors of drunken driving.

unfortunately the court is constrained by the vagaries of our law and the extremely lax

People v. Heidgen

sentencing statutes in place in New York. The defendant benefits from the fact that he killed two people and physically crippled three others by virtue of a single act.

Had he done these things separately, concurrent sentences would be available exposing him to much more time behind bars. Instead, his multiple crimes are counted as a single act with a single sentence while his multiple victims suffer multiple agonies.

This paradox is even worse when viewed in light of the fact that New York allows for a sentence of as little as fifteen years for murder, in this case multiple murder. This is offensive and wrong.

The lenient nature of New York's sentencing law stems from an overindulgence of criminals exemplified by the emphasis placed on the idea of rehabilitation. unfortunately we now know after many decades of leniency that rehabilitation does not work.

one must only review the recidivism rates in general or examine the number of murder victims whose killers were on parole to reached this conclusion.

However, even if one subscribes to the hope of rehabilitation, it should not trump the true

.20

People v. Heidgen

underpinnings of the penal system, deterrence and, most importantly, retribution.

The widespread media attention paid to this case provides a significant opportunity to deter potential drunk drivers through the imposition of the harshest sentence available. For too long drunk driving was treated as a minor infraction carrying the risk of just a fine or possibly a license suspension. This is, in large part, why it is still rampant.

By imposing the maximum available sentence, this court can convey the message that society will no longer treat drunk driving with a wink and a nod and a slap on the wrist. The case for a strong message on the issue of deterrence is clear. However, more important for my purposes is the issues of retribution.

For too long retribution has been disparaged as revenge by those who coddle criminals. It is seldom mentioned when, in fact, it is the most basic and most important of the three tenants of the penal system.

Deterrence is a wonderful side effect, but it does not address the crimes at issues which is what the sentence is actually supposed to do.

People v. Heidgen

Neither does rehabilitation address the actual crimes for which the criminal is being punished. worse, it elevates the interests of the criminal above those of society in general.

In this case, of course, rehabilitation should not even be considered. If we believe the defendant, he is simply a victim of circumstance with nothing to rehabilitate. Alternatively, we must recognize that his absolute lack of remorse, his consistent dishonesty and attempts to thwart justice during the trial, the pre-trial hearing and into the post-trial motions, render him a noncandidate for rehabilitation.

Deterrence and rehabilitation should be considered desirable byproducts of a prison sentence, but its true purpose should be retribution for what the criminal has done to his victims. In that regard, I will now attempt, futilely, I assure you, to convey some small sense of the horror and devastation the defendant has wreaked on me and my family.

when my wife advised me that it was time to start a family, I was very sceptical. I was not particularly fond of children, had very little experience with them and enjoyed my life just the way

6.

, 14

People v. Heidgen

it was. I now know how foolish this outlook was as I have learned that fatherhood is the greatest endeavor a man can undertake. My children are the focus of my existence. They justify my life. Without them, I would be nothing. Katie taught me all of this.

when I met her for the first time in the delivery room, it was as if someone flicked a light switch. My doubts and fears disappeared and I instantly fell in love with her. As she grew, my wife and I came to realize that being parents was the most satisfying thing to which we could ever aspire.

Katherine taught us what it really meant to be a family, to be in love, with her and each other. She opened my eyes as to what my life should really be about. She helped elevate my love for my wife to a level I didn't know existed. Sharing Katie brought us together and strengthened our marriage in a manner I cannot describe.

From the beginning, we knew Kate was a special child. our older relatives advised us not to. get used to that type of behavior from our children because you only get one like that. Now, as the father of four, I realize how true this was.

unlike other children, Kate woke up smiling, not crying, each morning. She would wait patiently

People v. Heidgen

in her crib until her mother or I would peek around the door jamb, and when she saw us, her face would light up like the sun. At the age of six months, she earned the first of many nicknames, smiling Kate. You can see from the pictures that that nickname was apt.

Kate's incredible effect on us quickly convinced yen and I to have more children. As our family moved from three to six in just five years, life just kept getting better, and Kate shined as both a daughter and a sister.

She was a quintessential big sister. She doted on her younger siblings and always included them in her games, even when she had friends over. she was Grace's best friend and loving guardian to Eamon and Colm. She loved to her help her mother in the kitchen, and my father-in-law once remarked that she was more mechanically inclined than yen and I put together.

I often say that while my wife and I are the foundation of our family, Kate is the cornerstone, the first and most important building block placed, without which there would be no more. Her absence has crippled our family as severely as you can imagine.

20.

People v. Heidgen

Every aspect of my life is defined by grief and anxiety over Katherine's death. The first sensory input I received upon regaining consciousness that night was the sound of my wife screaming, Neil, Katie's dead, Katie's dead. of course, I didn't want to believe. I told yen, No, she can't be, she is just hurt real bad, she'll be okay, I'II get help. of course, I didn't know my wife was holding my daughter's head in her hands when she yelled to me.

Ten knew Kate would never be okay, and despite my words, so did I. ${f I}$ simply didn't want to accept it.

Throughout that night, I begged the emergency workers and medical personnel to let me die. Today the only thing that keeps from me suicide is the responsibility of raising my other children. If Katie were an only child, I would have taken my own life a long time ago.

while my physical injuries are the least of my worries, they are objectively significant, and I will take a moment to describe them so you understand the context in which I suffer Katherine's loss.

The defendant broke my back in two places, he ruptured two of my spinal discs. He broke my nose and three of my ribs. He collapsed one of my lungs,

People v. Heidgen

damaged my heart, liver and bladder.

I spent a month in three different hospitals. I was separated from my wife for a week immediately after our daughter was killed. I had to be released from the hospital on a day pass to attend her wake and funeral in a wheel chair and gave her eulogy in a back brace propped up on crutches.

I have undergone two surgical procedures and will probably require future surgery because the fracture has not properly healed. I attend physical therapy two times a week for intense two-hour sessions. I am deprived of my family's company during this time, but it is necessary because, without therapy, I am physically incapable of working.

I am in constant pain which is exacerbated by every physical movement, including breathing and blinking. coughing and sneezing are agonizing. I slept in a recliner for five months after the crash because I couldn't lie flat in bed.

I can no longer run, bend or twist. My right leg gives out several times a month and I fall down. I cannot play physically with my children. sometimes they forget and jump on me. This makes me cry out in pain, and, on many occasions, I have come

People v. Heidgen

close to striking them. This is unspeakably ugly to me.

My wife has to shovel snow from our sidewalk. I have to ask friends to put up our Christmas tree or move pieces of furniture. I cannot change a flat tire, climb a ladder or carry grocery bags. I take 17 pills a day including antidepressants, blood pressure medications, muscle relaxers and painkillers.

The physical limitations briefly described here are, as I said, the least of my worries. They pale in comparison to the emotional and mental torment I suffer every day because of what this filthy child killer did to us.

From my first waking moment, my thoughts are dominated by sadness, grief and anxiety. At least three times a day I am overwhelmed by grief and break down in tears despite the fact that I take two powerful antidepressants. I frequently cry in front of my children. This is extremely painful to me and damaging to them.

My children suffer along with Jen and I.

Grace told us that she wished we had all died that night. She has slept in our bed every night since coming home from the hospital. she can't be alone in

People v. Heidgen

a room for more than a few seconds without being overcome by fear. she attends therapy, but it does not help. she has told us that her therapists don't know what they are doing and therapy does nothing.

Grace is six.

I also attended therapy for over a year. It meant more time away from my family, but I hoped it would ease my pain. It did not, and I abandoned it.

I have no hope of life without grief. I do not look forward to the future except to the extent it brings me closer to the release of death.

My son Eamon lives in fear of the defendant who he refers to as the bad man who killed Katie. He too sleeps in our bed every night because his room is closest to the landing and he's afraid the bad man will get him first when he comes up the stairs. I tell him that I will protect him, but we both know that I didn't protect Katie. so my words are empty. He cries over the loss of his sister every day.

My son colm is to young to comprehend these events. His suffering consists of being deprived of the love and compassion of his big sister, watching his parents and siblings suffer from being deprived of their full support and nurturing care. I expect that in time his memory of Katie will fade to

People v Heidgen

shadows. This saddens me.

when I wake, I silently wish Kate good morning. I do not believe she can hear me but I hope so. I rise slowly because of the pain in my back. I limp to the bathroom and swallow the first of eight painkillers and six muscle relaxers I will take each day.

I perform my ablutions through a veil of tears, wracked with sobs. I dress and descend the stairs, stopping on the landing to kiss the cold glass covering Kate's picture saying I love you Katie as I do so. I sullenly kiss my wife and three of my children good-bye.

I drive to work alone frequently crying or screaming with rage. When I see a clear blue sky, I speak to Katie again, not believing, only hoping she hears me. I struggle through my workday consumed and distracted by my grief and pain. I have no confidence in my ability to continue to provide for my family and this makes my anxiety worse.

when i return home from work, I take my dinner alone in my room. I cannot stand to sit at the table with Kate's empty chair. Each night, I make some excuse for my other three children as to why I cannot eat with them, but they know I'm lying.

People v. Heidgen

I do not know how my wife does it, beyond my general knowledge that she is the strongest woman I ever met. I fear someday it will prove to much for her. It pains me to see this once vibrant woman crushed under the weight of her suffering. she alone knows how much I miss Kate. Although we console each other as best we can, I cannot stop her pain.

we hug, but rarely kiss. our embraces are not passionate, only conciliatory. Our conversations are brief and usually marked by tears.

By eight o'clock, I'm exhausted and bent over with pain. I take a heavy dose of medication so I can get a few hours of uninterrupted sleep.

I no longer pray with my three other children. I have no faith. I tell them that we must wish Kate good night and sweet dreams and that someday we will be reunited with her. I do not believe this but I hope it is true. My hope is desperate because I believe it is futile.

As I drift into fitful, drug induced sleep, I try to talk silently to Katie to tell her about her brothers and sister, but I feel awkward and foolish because I don't know if she can hear me.

This is especially painful because when Kate was here with me things were never awkward. we could

People v. Heidgen

sit in silence holding hands and watching \overline{V} or laugh and sing uproariously and unselfconsciously. Now I am reduced to stumbling, halting words in my head and find myself repeating I miss you over and over again. I feel quilty for burdening her with my grief.

My sleep is punctuated by nightmares and I wake often. I rarely dream of Katie alive. I have done so only three times since her death. Although waking from these dreams is incredibly painful, I wish I had them more often. I wake after three or four hours and stare aimlessly at the pointless television. I drift back to sleep in the early morning for a few more fitful hours before starting the cycle again.

I do not know joy. I have no hope for a better future here on earth. I hope but do not believe I will see my daughter again. Iam wracked with guilt for denying my other three children the father they deserve but I cannot overcome my sadness. My life is desolate:

MS. MCCORMICK: That concludes the victim impact statements.

THE COURT: May I see counsel at the bench, please?

(whereupon, an off-the-record conversation

People v. Heidgen took place at the bench.) 1 I think, at this time, ladies 2 THE COURT: 3 and gentlemen, we are going to break the proceedings until a quarter to two. See you then. 4 (whereupon, a luncheon recess was taken.) 5 AFTERNOONSESSION 6 7 THE CLERK: On the record please, Indictment 1910-05, the People against martin 8 9 Heidgen. Case on for sentencing. 10 Defendant ready. MR. LAMAGNA: 11 THE COURT: Mr. Martello, Mr. Lamagna, would 12 one you of like to address me? 13 MR. LAMAGNA: Judge, before Mr. Martello and ${
m I}$ make our statement to the Court, we would ask the 14 15 Court's indulgence to have various family members of 16 the Heidgen family address this Court. 17 THE COURT: Yes, of course. MR. LAMAGNA: ' We would ask first for victor 18 19 Aponte. 20 MR. APONTE: Good afternoon, your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Aponte. *22 MR. APONTE: My name is victor Aponte. I am 23 Marty's stepfather. I met Marty in 2004 when he 24 moved to New York. I was dating his mother at the 25 time. I asked Marty for his mother's hand in

People v. Heidgen

marriage.

I was so impressed with Marty's southern politeness and his maturity for his young age. Marty showed so much enthusiasm towards his job. Every day he came home talking about his plans for the future and job opportunities in New York.

He showed me -- he told me that getting on the train every morning with everyone headed to work was like getting a burst of energy. He loved being part of the working force. His dedication and perseverance was admirable for a young man of his age.

Marty always was so willing to help his mother and me in any task that we asked. on Sundays we would watch football games and discuss the plays. He enjoyed cooking for us on weekends. It amazed me to see his culinary abilities. Marty is very family oriented and enjoys good conversation over a well prepared meal.

For people to say that Marty and i were having problems over my marriage with his mother is nothing but a lie.

I was very impressed with his love and respect for his mother. Many times Marty told me that he was -- he told me that he was working hard

People v. Heidgen

and looking forward to a good future so he could take care of his mother. He said that he would never consider putting her in a retirement home.

what I saw in Marty was a happy, young man who was looking forward to his future and fascinated with the challenges in life. Marty's ability to relate to young children helped establish a great relationship with my grandson Andrew who was always asking when he would see Marty again to play.

Marty is a very kind-hearted person who under no circumstances would purposely hurt anyone. His hundreds of hours of charitable work is proof of the kind of person that Marty is. He did volunteer work for the Dorkus House of battered women. This place provides support and a home for women who have nowhere to go after being beaten by their husbands or boyfriends.

He helped the Leap Frog program in oxford,
Mississippi. This charity helps underprivileged kids
and provides mentorship for them; Marty also coached
a soccer team for children, seven and eight-year
olds, at the YMCA. He co-directed soccer camps for
kids ages five through twelve at the Little Rock
Athletic Club. He designed T-shirts for the 5K run
with proceeds benefiting st. Judes Cancer Research

People v. Heidgen

Hospital in Memphis.

This, your Honor, is the life of someone who would never, never set out to intentionally hurt anyone.

The day of duly 2nd, 2005, Marty made the mistake of drinking and driving after a 4th of July party. This caused a tragic accident which resulted in the loss of the lives of Katie Flynn and Stanley Rabinowitz. Marty will always have to live with this guilt on his conscience.

I know Marty made a mistake for which he wants to take responsibility but to punish him for a long sentence would not be fair and just.

Marty got lost because he barely drove on Long Island. He worked in the city and took the train. He had very little experience driving on the Island.

Your Honor, this is a young man who has lead a life of service to others. At the age of 24, Marty had given more to society than most people do in a lifetime.

His character is immutable. It doesn't change because of one mistake. I am not talking about someone would has a pattern of hurting people. on the contrary, he is always ready to help those in

People V. Heidgen

need.

Please, your Honor, give him an opportunity to redeem himself. Justice is about fairness. what good would it be for society and for Marty to spend many years in prison?

I beg of you, your Honor, take all this into consideration and make a decision as a parent and as a judge that is fair for everyone. Please; your Honor, Marty is my wife's only child. Please, be lenient. Thank you.

THE COURT: You are welcome.

MR. LAMAGNA: Your Honor, we would ask that Kurt Heidgen address the court.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. K. HEIDGEN: Your Honor, I'm Marty Heidgen's father. I think I know him as well as anybody and probably better than anybody. We have a close relationship.

it really is painful to hear the prosecutor categorize him the way she has but there's not really any basis as far as--- you know, the case is bad enough, tragic enough, and I can only imagine the agonies the Rabinowitzes and Flynns have gone through. I mean, I can't imagine. It's beyond comprehension. But to say that he would deliberately

People v. Heidgen

do anything like this, it breaks my heart, because he's a good person and it's the furthest thing from the truth.

It was a tragic accident. The end results are the same as so many accidents. Again, you know, he's devastated. It's been 20 months since the accident on July the 2nd. we have all suffered a lot. Maybe in comparison to the other families, maybe it's not much. I don't know how it can be any worse because he's an only son, an only child. They have had the burden of seeing him two or three times a week and it's tuff. It's really tuff. It's tuff for all of us.

I don't live here. I'm an over-the-road truck driver, so I'm, you know, in forty-eight states and I try to get back here as often as I can. As a truck driver, I see drinking and driving and accidents all the time. It's tragic. There's no easy answer to the problem and I don't have an -answer.

I.-think that, you know, just putting somebody in prison for a long time is not necessarily a positive thing because it didn't seem like I heard anything this morning about, you know, what positive could come out of this, except that maybe this tragic

17,

People V. Heidgen

accident, there will be more thought put into warning young people particularly about the dangers of drinking and driving.

That's something Marty would be very good at. He relates very well to young people and he's devastated. As you will hear when his achievements are run through, the work with the center, the young kids, he really likes the young kids'. He has coached them.

so little Katie's death was -- you know again, for a week he couldn't talk. we couldn't speak to him because he was totally devastated by what he had done. Maybe some of his sorrow was for himself. I don't know. But it seemed it was the tragedy he caused more than anything else. I don't know what the results were.

I think Margo is going to tell you about some of his achievements. I could start listing them but, to me -- he graduated in 2003 from the university of Mississippi with a degree in history and also in Spanish. He went out and was successful working.

He had many friends from all walks here. I was most proud that he went through a private school system, a catholic school system, and he was a good

People V. Heidgen

student. He went through with a lot of privileged kids in a private school. But, in the full spectrum, mostly more affluent kids, and he related to those kids real well. But he went outside that school and related to kids in public schools. He related to blacks, Hispanics, all kinds of people.

I think that was evident in the way he was liked by his peers. He was captain of the soccer team, captain of the rifle team. They liked him and respected him.

so I am proud of him for his character, the way he was able to reach other people and didn't have any preconceptions about anybody and got along with everybody. They liked him and we loved him for that aspect.

so, you know, what's happened is just -most of these **DUI** cases are a good person did a bad
thing. You know, again, it's devastating. words can
can't, you know, solve the problem. we would just
like to reach out somehow to the people. They are
not here right now, but, obviously they are extremely
angry and, you know, it's just a tragic thing.

I ask you to take these things into consideration about martin Heidgen and try to find it in your heart to see that there's goodness in his

18.

People v. Heidgen

heart and that he would someday be a real positive influence as far as relating his personal tragedy to others. If he could just save one life, it would be well worthwhile.

If he has the opportunity at sometime in the future to do that, knowing him like I do, I know that's what he would do. He'll be a great citizen and is a great citizen, but he would be a real positive influence on many people. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: You are welcome.

MR. LAMAGNA: Margo Aponte.

MRS. APONTE: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MRS. APONTE: Good afternoon, everybody.

I am Marty's mother. I want to take this opportunity to tell the Flynn family and the Rabinowitz family how truly and deeply sorry I feel for the pain and suffering my son, Marty, has caused in your lives. You are and always will be in my prayers.

This is a tragedy that has affected so many lives. I have also experienced pain because of what's happening to my son, my only child.

I know you and your family understand how

People v. Heidgen

this accident, this disaster, has turned everyone's life into a nightmare. My son made a horrible mistake. He understands he has to take full responsibility for what he did.

I know my son. I raised him to be sensitive, kind-hearted person. In the 21 years prior to the accident, Marty has been a faithful servant to God, to his family and to those in need.

There's only a small number of young adults with a service record like Marty's. Your Honor, you have over a hundred letters written to you from all over the country that speak about Marty and his character.

All the letters, in different words, all say what kind of person my son is, responsible with a strong work ethic, an exemplary citizen, optimistic, athletic and always involved in sports, a good friend who has always and will always give whatever he has to his friends.

He was elected captain of his high school soccer team by his peers, not only because he was one of the best team players, but also because they believed he was the fairest leader. During his high school years, he joined the ROTC where, again, he was elected by his peers to be the captain of the rifle

People v. Heidgen

team.

Marty always stayed very active. He did hundreds of hours of community service, always helping those less fortunate, coaching unprivileged children and providing mentorship for them in the Leap Frog program in oxford, Mississippi. He also volunteered to coach a soccer team for children ages seven and eight at the YMCA.

My son, your Honor, would come home talking. He was so proud of having an opportunity to help children with difficulties in sports. He would say, Mom, that is why I like soccer, because anyone can play, tall people, short people, It doesn't matter a person's size, It's about skills, mom, and I can help these children develop them and feel good about themselves. This., your Honor, is how my son feels.

Marty also helped organize fundraising activities to help the Dorkus House and battered women. He helped sell and deliver poinsettias during Christmas to raise money for these abused women. This is my son. which young man at the age of 16 would spend his free time helping battered women? My son did.

During this time, he also worked at the athletic club in Little Rock where he headed the Down

People v. Heidgen

under Program. This is for children ages four through seven. I remember so many parents would stop and tell me how much the children loved Marty and how appreciative the parents were of his love and dedication to the little ones.

Marty continued his volunteer work in college. He volunteered his time in organizations such as st. Jude's Cancer Research Hospital where he organized and participated in different charitable fundraising activities.

In the **Pi** Kappa Alpha fraternity, he volunteered to be a chaplain and also the philanthropy chairman. My son never forgot his responsibilities to others, your Honor.

As parents, Marty's father and I taught him love, compassion and religious principles. He went to catholic schools, and, with so much pride, we saw our Marty develop into a caring, optimistic and responsible human being. This, your Honor, is my son.

Measure the man by his actions. Look at his life. Put the incident in perspective. I implore you, while in the quiet of your chambers, to consider my son and judge his actions in the context of his entire life.

People v. Heidgen

I know Marty is deeply remorseful for the pain he has caused the Rabinowitz and the Flynn family. My son has to live with his conscience the rest of his life. He is in utter shock as to how his life has changed. He is living in pain and remorse. Every time I visit him, he tells me his faith in God is helping him get through this.

All of our lives have been changed since that tragic morning of July 2nd, 2005. It was clear that my son was lost, not knowing where he was going on an unlit parkway. He was unfamiliar with the roads in New York. He only had lived here a few months. He worked in the city where he took the train. He was going to meet friends. He called them several times to get directions. He called them again when he was lost.

My son made the terrible mistake to drive under the influence of alcohol which resulted in this horrible accident. For that, he takes full responsibility.

Is it fair to charge him with murder?

Absolutely not. At least twelve other alcohol related accidents have happened on Long Island since Marty's and no one has been charged with murder.

we just saw how Karen Fisher, with a

People v. Heidgen

previous record, with a suspended driver's license, who has driven while intoxicated with children in the car, killed Garden city priest monsignor William Costello and left the scene of the accident, has been charged with manslaughter. Just this month, they negotiated a plea bargain.

Then there's Young Cho, a drunken driver with a vehicular assault conviction, who killed a father and is charged with manslaughter.

In July of 2005, a former firefighter killed a teenager and received thirty-two days behind bars and then, in January of 2007, Danielle Baymack is charged with second degree manslaughter for the death of fellow officer while driving drunk. The list goes on and on, your Honor.

In each of these cases, the accused received manslaughter. My son is the only one charged with murder. Did he have a prior record? $_{\text{No.}}$ But he alone was singled out.

Your Honor, where is the justice here?

Marty's case is also a DWI case. It is not a murder case. Please, your Honor, don't single him out and place him in a class by himself. He's guilty of driving drunk which resulted in the death of two people but no more than those peoples I have listed.

People v. Heidgen

The tragic circumstances of all the media attention pushed this to be a murder case but it is not.

what I ask you today, your Honor, is to provide all the families involved justice. Look at Marty's life and how my son has contributed to society. Judge his actions in context. Look at his life. was his life reckless? No, it was not. He was a caring individual who helped others all the time and just made a horrible mistake. He's prepared to pay for that.

Please, your Honor, for the sake of what is just, temper your decision taking all that I have said into consideration. Please, give my son an opportunity to redeem himself. Thank you.

MR. LAMAGNA: Your Honor, Father Thomas.

FATHER THOMAS: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

FATHER THOMAS: Thank you for the permission to address you today and all those who are present.

Before I offer my prepared remarks, I think I would be very remiss not to recognize the extraordinary accounts that we heard this morning of the pain and suffering from this accident. It was truly extraordinary, and as I will indicate later in

People v. Heidgen

my prepared remarks, as I have prayed for all of you these past months, I promise you, to the Rabinowitz and Flynn families, to continue praying, most likely, for all my life as a priest.

I come here for two reasons: To join with the Marty's family to ask for mercy and leniency and, also, to give voice with Marty. It is our faith tradition, in the]ewish-Christian tradition, to never ever Abandon another human being for any reason. I can only be true to myself, as a priest who has grown to know and love this young man, to never abandon him. so, as I promise to pray for victims, I also promise never to abandon him.

Some may wonder why a priest would insert himself in this room, in this tragedy, in this caldron of pain and suffering. I present myself today as a priest, a minister of faith who has been very attentive to this case. But, most of all, I present myself because I am a pastor and martin Heidgen is my parishioner.

In the catholic tradition to which Martin and I belong, as do many in this tragedy, I bear the very sacred responsibility to minister to martin for a spiritual and pastoral well being. Martin has given me the privilege of offering that ministry,

People v. Heidgen

and, I have come to know him very well. I say without qualification, I know his heart, and I would be less a man not to be here today and to meet my responsibility as a pastor.

This entire tragedy has been filled with so much pain and so much sorrow, so much sadness and grief. This morning you heard broken hearts speak.

It is so evident that Katie Flynn was so deeply and well loved as a daughter, sister and a granddaughter, and Stanley Rabinowitz was so well loved as a dad and a husband.

The broken heartedness we heard this morning, I'm sure, saddened everyone in this room and is almost indelibly described in our hearts and minds and memories.

As I indicated earlier, I assure you, I come here as a priest who was has prayed, not only in the morning but also in the evening, for all of you, for the Flynn and Rabinowitz families, for Katie and Stanley, for martin and his family and for you, Judge.

The pain of the Flynn and Rabinowitz

families is beyond what I have ever experienced and what I can imagine. I am not a spouse. I am not a parent. But, as a priest, repeatedly, I have shared

People v. Heidgen

in the pain of spouses and siblings. It is my vocation.

My prayers these months have been for many intentions but all my prayers have been governed by a desire for healing, healing for all. Because I have not experienced the profound sadness and loss of the families of Katie and Stanley, I can only share my empathy and continue to pray for your healing as I have promised and for the healing of all others who loved these two people.

I respect, I have reverence, I recognize the holiness and sacredness of the Rabinowitz family, the grief and sadness of the Rabinowitz family and the Flynn family. As another human being and as a priest, I share that role. It is the right thing for all of us to do. It is what God calls us to do, to reverence that grief that we heard.

At the same time, in my vocation as pastor, I know too that martin has been very well loved by his family, and though different from the pain of the Flynn and Rabinowitz families, as his mom and dad and stepdad just shared, martin's family is also filled with sadness over these past 20 months. I am here because I have come to know their pain through my ministry.

People V Heidgen

I believe the court needs to know about that. I know that martin accepts responsibility for what happened in July of 2005, and I know he struggles every day with that responsibility. He feels it deeply in his heart and I know that with certainty. I join with his mom and dad in acknowledging his responsibility and join to that this plea for leniency and mercy.

Concerning the accident and deaths of Katie and Stanley, he was profoundly sad. He has shared with me repeatedly on numerous occasions his feelings and emotions about this tragedy. He has expressed to me his deep since of remorse and repentance. We have shared readings about this topic from scripture and contemporary literature.

He feels deeply the responsibility he shoulders for what has happened. The deaths and injuries caused by his driving while intoxicated causes him much sadness and sorrow. He too is destroyed and broken hearted. His words and his tears have made-this clear. He knows he is responsible. At the same time, there was no intention on his part to cause harm.

I am often called as a priest to minister to people in grief and sorrow and remorse. I am often

People v. Heidgen

called to discern with people their intentions. I do it often. I have no doubt about the depths of Martin's sorrow and I have no doubt that he had any intention to cause anyone harm in the early morning hours of duly 2nd, 2005.

Some have questioned his expression of remorse. we all know that some people express their remorse and sorrow in very public ways. USUALLY such public expression is very sincere and heartfelt.

Occasionally its sincerity is in question.

some people, such as martin, express their remorse or sorrow in more private ways. Maybe you are one of those people and sometimes that is questioned. But that someone expresses sorrow in a more private manner in no way reflects necessarily a lack of depth of sorrow. Again, I declare to you, Martin feels both responsible and profoundly remorseful for all that has transpired.

He has been convicted under the description of having exhibited depraved indifference to life.

All who new martin prior to this accident know that he never demonstrated any kind of behavior indicative of a depraved indifference to life. In fact, just the opposite was true.

As his parents just said, he always

21-

People V Heidgen

expressed a love for life, a love, kindness and compassion for others, care, respect and reverence for others. His personal history, academic, athletic and socially, all indicate a love and respect for life. He tells me with great delight how during high school he worked with kids in summer camp and soccer clinics. The administration of his high school in Arkansas had nothing but positive things to say to me about him.

At college, he brought his faith and conviction to his fraternity and served as a chaplain. In that role, he organized prayer services and organized community projects. In addition, he became involved in inter-faith projects and worked with victims of abuse, as his mother just outlined.

in his immediate employment after college, he used his bilingual skills to assist Spanish speaking clients. Throughout his high school and college years, he expressed a love for life and respect for others, a true reverence for the gift of what it means to be a human being, and all those experiences taken together make even more profound his sense of responsibility and guilt and remorse for the deaths of Katie and Stanley.

It is no exaggeration, my friends, to say

People v. Heidgen

that martin has expressed and practiced an unusually high level of faith for a young man in his twenties. In the short time that martin was a parishioner in valley stream, his presence was noted each Sunday at mass because not too many single young men of his age are regular church goers. Martin's quiet, but regular, weekend attendance was noteworthy and always observed.

His religious formation that his mother spoke about and his religious practice that I have noticed indicate that he knows well and feels very humanly the experience of guilt and remorse, the need for that very sacred experience necessary for every human being, the need for repentance.

Even under the circumstances of these past 20 months, he has continued to express his faith. At the weekly mass at the county jail, martin has ministered both as sacristan and as lector. He has assisted the priest there and set up for mass and he proclaimed the Sacred readings to the other inmates.

He has outreached to the other inmates at the jail using, again, his bilingual skills to teach English. He has been most cooperative with the policies and procedures of the jail.

This tragedy continues to be traumatic and

People v. Heidgen

it continues to be traumatic for martin. People in trauma struggle every day, as we heard this morning, to maintain their faith, to believe in God's love and to find meaning and confidence in God's word. I have been amazed at his ability to maintain his life of spirit and soul this past year and a half.

I say -- I can say with no embarrassment, my visits to him has enriched my humanity and my priesthood.

I hear a man who is intelligent and articulate about many topics from sports to politics to religion. i see a young man who can still greet me when he walks through the visitor's section of the prison, still greet me with a smile. Yet, I know his heart is heavy with sorrow.

He is a person who knows he is responsible for a terrible tragedy that does require punishment. But, at the same time, as is so often the case with human experience, he yearns, desires, longs, hopes, for another opportunity to live a life in which he can make a positive contribution to the lives of others.

So, for me, as a priest, as a human being, as a man who has grown to know this young man so well, the question is, how does justice allow for

People v. Heidgen

that opportunity. we have to be confident that justice does that.

Today's sentencing of martin is the concluding step in the legal process of this court that has the sacred charge and awesome responsibility to effect useful justice. In the Jewish-Christian faith and tradition that so many in this room share, justice is understood as one of the greatest virtues, a virtue so awesome that the psalmist of the Jewish-Christian tradition ultimately leaves the fulfillment of justice to God.

still, as seen in the story of Moses and through the proclamation of the prophets, God who creates us in his own image and likeness, as Genesis tell us, invites us to join with God in working out justice. So justice is part of our faith tradition we share as well part of our nation's ambition and this court's ambition.

So true justice always transcends politics. True justice, the People have the right to expect to be consistent, fair minded and even handed. The tradition of justice looks to prior example. True justice does not set example to make a point. True justice makes sure its consistent with law. So justice always depends on wisdom and is often checked

People v. Heidgen

by temperance.

So that brings me directly to the precise question for the final step today: what is the appropriate sentence for martin? certainly a just sentence is one that respects the truth and surely it has a healthy purpose.

Does an appropriate sentence serve the purpose of retribution? Retribution usually leaves the human person unsatisfied and still hurting. we experienced that this morning.

Does an appropriate sentence serve the purpose of deterrence? Sociological studies question the deterrent value of harsh sentences.

Is the purpose of martin's sentence rehabilitation? His past behavior, attitudes and actions, as we have come to know them, do not demonstrate the great need for rehabilitation. He has no previous criminal record. His prison behavior has been excellent.

So what **is** it that we hope for today, a very difficult question. whatever sentence is given will serve as a punishment for martin's responsibility for the deaths that his driving while intoxicated caused a year and a half ago.

The time he serves in prison will be a time

People v. Heidgen

that he continues to deal with what he has done. I know him well enough, I know him better than anyone in this courtroom, except for his family, and, with that knowledge, I expect that martin will use the time as best he can.

It is my hope that he will continue to share his gifts and talents with other inmates as he has already done here in Nassau County. It is my prayer that he will be able to maintain his interior strength that has allowed him to be a man of such strong spirit and soul.

As his pastor, it is my responsibility to continue to assist him in that regard and I assure . the court I will continue to take that responsibility seriously.

His family requests leniency and mercy. I join in making that request. I believe the maximum sentence of 25 years to life will only serve the purpose of retribution. A sentence of lesser duration will encourage and allow this man to continue to understand his responsibility, to do whatever he can to be a positive influence in the very difficult prison system and to look forward to returning as a productive member of our society.

we who know martin best know that he is not

21,

People v. Heidgen

a person with a depraved indifference for life and we believe he had no intent to hurt anyone on that tragic morning. we also give witness that when he returns from prison, whenever that will be, he will not be a danger to society.

Along with his family, your Honor, $\,I\,$ ask you to offer him leniency and mercy as you assign his sentence and $\,I\,$ thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Thank you, Father.

MR. LAMAGNA: If I may?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. LAMAGNA: Your Honor, this is the culmination of probably one of the most difficult matters, I think, any of us will probably see. The pain and suffering, the sorrow that has been exhibited in this case. This case truly was about a tragedy of immeasurable proportions.

unfortunately we cannot change what has happened and we can not undo what has been done. I come before this court, not only as an advocate and as an attorney representing a client, but I also come to this Court as a person, as a father, as a son with deep sorrow and grief stricken for the pain that we all were influenced by during the course of this trial. In fact, I speak for everybody who has been

People v. Heidgen

associated with this case that we will forever feel the palpable pain that was exhibited in this courtroom.

Now, I believe it was Mrs. Tangney who said that they are the victims here. They certainly are the victims, the Flynn family, the Rabinowitz family and the Tangney family. They are the victims. They always have been. There has never been any dispute concerning that.

They did everything right that night. They did take the limousine to avoid -- to be safe. I agree with that. we all agree with that. That's what makes what happened that night so tragic.

But I'm also grief stricken from hearing everything that was said today, for, also, the loss of a promising young man, a 23 year old, that we see before this court charged and now convicted of murder for a moment in time that, if he could take it back, he certainly would. I think miss McCormick said, that moment in time that caused such tragedy, I couldn't agree more.

There are times in life where a moment becomes a defining moment in a person's life but that moment doesn't define who that person is or how they had lived their life.

People v. Heidgen

Certainly July 2nd, 2005, was the defining moment in many people's lives that appeared in this courtroom and it was a defining moment in Marty's life. But, again, that moment does not define who stands before you to be sentenced today. It doesn't define the manner in which he lived his life prior to that dreadful, tragic night and it is one of the issues that I ask this court to consider when meteing out a sentence. It is not only the crime itself, the conduct, the impact on the victims, but also who stands before you to be sentenced.

Now, we heard many things concerning who Martin Heidgen is. Many of the things and many of the statements made by many of the people were from people who never met Mr. Heidgen, never spoke to Marty, never associated with Marty.

The truth -- the truth is there is an objective truth, empirical truth, and then there's truth that people want to believe is the truth because they need to believe that that is the truth.

Many of the things that were said about

Martin today and throughout the last 20 months were

from people who never even spoke to Marty, never knew
his background, but it was a truth that they believed
to be the truth because they needed it to be that

People v. Heidgen

truth because of the monumental tragedy that occurred here. But what was said is empirically and objectively not the truth about the young man who stands before you.

NOW, your Honor, I had submitted about a hundred -- a little more than a hundred letters to you that I know you have read. Those are from people who know Marty their entire lives. These are from people who Marty has influenced positively for the 23 years that he has been either in Arkansas or in New York.

Prior to July 2nd, 2005, by reading these letters and from all accounts, whether it's through the letters or through probation, Marty lived a caring, wonderful, selfless life, an honorable life that brought him to this defining moment, a life any parent would have been proud of.

we have heard through Marty's mom how he was raised, we know he was raised in Arkansas and he went to Catholic school. what's important to note, Judge, is that all of the things that this young man did at 15, 16 years old, he didn't need to do, didn't have to do and he wasn't forced to do. He voluntarily did this because this is what he wanted to do.

People v. Heidgen

He didn't have to join and serve in the ROTC. He chose to do that. He didn't have to work. He chose to. He didn't work in some sporting goods store. He didn't work at some Mcoonald's. He chose, at 16 years old, to work as a supervisor of a day care center. That is the tragic irony here, that Marty spent a bulk of his young adult life working with children, not because he had to, but because he chose to, and that is the truth. This is the life he has lead.

Not only did he work as a supervisor of a day care center, he co-directed a summer camp when he was at school for children five to twelve years old, not because he had to, but because of who he is, a man who is standing before this court to be sentenced.

Furthermore, he volunteered, as we heard from his mom, at the local YMCA to coach young children on the weekends in soccer, children who either didn't have parents that were available to coach their children or children who came from single-family homes that didn't have a dad to be there. He did it. He didn't have to. He chose to.

This is the type of person that stands before you. He was voted captain of his soccer team,

People V. Heidgen

not because he was the best player, but because he was voted by his peers for his leadership qualities, his compassion and to deal with other people. That's not the only thing we heard. While in the ROTC, he was voted captain of his rifle team.

The reason I bring this up, Judge, is how many young people have come before you in our judicial system, or in our personal lives, that we have seen at such a young age, when you are a teenager, that gave so much?

I see teenagers all the time that live pretty much as, no offense to that teenager, but pretty much selfish lives, not in a negative sense, but they don't need to be doing anything at this point. They are living their lives going to school and playing. He chose not to do that and that is the truth. That is a fact.

So not only do we have to look upon the tremendous tragedy of this case, which is obvious, the desires of the victims and their families, but I ask you, look at the person whom is about to be sentenced, what his life was like.

That moment, that defining moment of duly 2nd, 2005, does not define the manner in which he, this young man, lead his life.

People v. Heidgen

The letters that I submitted, that I had the opportunity as well to read, from over a hundred people, all have a similar theme about them, about how they articulate their thoughts of Marty, caring, compassionate, loving human being, as you recall in some of those letters. They all say the same.

These aren't letters just from family members or friends. we have letters from neighbors. Neighbors like we have, where we see a young child growing up before our eyes, our neighbors. You have letters from them, neighbors who have known martin since he was a baby, as he grew through high school.

You have letters from teachers, elementary teachers that still recall having martin in their classrooms. We have letters from college professors, one in particular who starts out her letter, if you may recall, saying it is remarkable that I can even recall a student given the nature of the university of Mississippi where there's four hundred people in a classroom. That says something. That means something. It's who this person is.

It's the moment, it was a defining moment, but it doesn't define him.

we have letters from attorneys who were either fathers of friends of his, assistant district

1.1

People v. Heidgen

attorneys who lived on his block and watched him grow, who actually represented, as defense attorneys, and prosecuted cases like this, as we all have, members of the clergy, co-workers, employers, the whole gamut of all of the people that you as a person living in this world would come into contact with.

All of them submitted letters, letters from all around the country, on behalf of martin. They didn't have to do that. They are not family members. They are college professors, teachers, neighbors, but they did.

They bestirred themselves to put pen to paper on behalf of somebody they may not have seen in the last three or four years, or, in some cases, in seven or eight years, but they remembered him from their classrooms and they wrote that letter. That says something.

How many 23 years olds, at the time this accident occurred, would have been able to have one hundred people from all walks of life, at such a young age, to influence that many people, to write letters on his behalf? I don't know how many people who are sixty who have met that many people in their lives who would be able to have a hundred people write in on behalf of them.

People v. Heidgen

The people who have spoken of martin and of his character today have never met him. They don't know him. I urge you, Judge, listen to what has been said by people who know him as to who the person is that stands before you.

Now, many times defendants stand before you with terrible criminal records, terrible backgrounds. In fact, the legislature actually penalizes, under certain circumstances, for a prior conviction, as a predicate to have you make -- to make you serve more of a sentence. so a bad character, a bad past, a bad background enures to the detriment of a defendant who stands before you ready to be sentenced.

So too -- so too must a person's good background, good character, the manner in which he lived in a positive way, it has to have some positive influence in arriving at what a just sentence would be.

Now, it is not my position today to relitigate any of the facts of this case. The trial, we went through that. There is a verdict. At this point, Mr. Heidgen is convicted of murder and your Honor is going to sentence him today on that charge.

The purpose here, your Honor, is the obvious. I am going to articulate truthfully -- not

People v. Heidgen

based upon what I am saying, I'm his advocate here, I'm his attorney, don't take my word for his character, take the word of the hundreds of letters from the people who put pen to paper to try to explain to you, who now has this awesome responsibility now of sentencing somebody.

Somebody said earlier this morning that justice is blind and that is true. Justice is that elusive quality that we try to balance the needs of all competing interests out of society, out of the aggrieved parties, the victims and the pain they receive, as well as where does this person fit in, in the context of all others that come before you.

unfortunately, as we heard from Marty's mom at length, terrible DWI related homicide, manslaughters or murders, are not treated consistently within our system. Justice, in our criminal justice system, has to have consistency that all people are treated equally who are similarly situated who have committed the same crime, should be treated similarly.

Now, martin's mom mentioned the Karen Fisher case and, for obvious reasons, in that case that person received a sentence of three and a half to ten years -- or she hasn't been sentenced yet. That was

People v.Heidgen

the plea agreement. But what was most important or significant to me when I read that was it said, Karen Fisher meekly standing $i\!n$ a large courtroom empty but for her estranged husband, empty.

This courtroom has never been empty. Even when we needed to do an adjournment, it was never empty. What does that say now with respect to cases that have this cavalcade of media attention on it?

Do people in the spotlight in a high profile case, defendants, get treated more harshly than in a quiet courtroom? I suspect not. It can't be. We can't believe that that could happen in our experiences but there is some imbalance in what's happening.

High profile cases like the Staten Island

Ferry, yes, ten, twelve people were killed by a

person who was in the position and the job to ferry

people to work, and besides the ten or twelve people

that died, people were maimed, amputations and the

like. He wasn't charged with murder. I think he did

a year.

Joseph Grant, a New York city police officer killed a family of four and a police officer; manslaughter, five to fifteen. Two to six, time served and probation, Christina Page (phonetic).

 ${
m I}$ don't know what that means necessarily.

. 3

People v. Heidgen

what I do know is that justice needs to be aligned.

People who commit similar acts with similar results,

regardless of the attention given, cannot be held to
a higher standard than others.

People who commit a DWI related homicide of a non-US citizen who has no family at all in the united States can't get a better sentence by virtue of that than somebody who commits the same crime with the same result to a US citizen who has victim's rights and MADD and family members saying we want more time. It can't be that way.

we can't value the lives of people. That one person's life is not worth more than another person's life.

The pain is all the same. I can't imagine what the Flynns and the Tangneys and the Rabinowitzes went through. I can only empathize but I can never imagine.

Judge, the legislature gives you the discretion on murder cases to sentencing a defendant from 15 years to life to a maximum of 25 to life. That is a ten-year window, almost double, difference between the minimum and maximum, same crime, murder. They are all murder. who gets the 25 to life? The worst, heinous, intentional murderer.

People v. Heidgen get 15, it's still a murder.

so who fits in the 15, if we know what the 25 to life murderer is? what murderer or what conviction for murder gets 15? Certainly an unintentional murder, certainly somebody who has a past that devoted his entire life to helping others.

This was a defining moment in his life. It does not define who stands before you. His deeds, the manner in which he lived his life, defines who he is, how he lived his life.

In light -- I have asked myself, learning about his background, how can somebody who in so few years of life have given so much of himself to volunteer work, to charity work, to working with children and positively influenced so many people at such a young age, yet, in one moment, so negatively and tragically affect others, and that's the conundrum here.

People say that Marty is not remorseful. we heard that from various speakers today. we heard that from the prosecution table. There's no book about how somebody is supposed to react under stress or under extreme circumstances. There's times people are crying at a table, and they say, oh, that's crocodile tears, that's not good. Sometimes people

People v. Heidgen

don't say anything. well, he's not paying attention. He doesn't care. Some people are smiling because they are nervous. oh, well, he thinks this is a joke.

we can't look at somebody, especially a 23 to now 25 year old, in the eye of this hurricane where he is sitting charged with murder looking at life in prison, and say, well, I am going to look at him and I am going to ask him -- I'm going to say to myself is he showing remorse.

He can't speak during the pendency of a criminal trial. We all know that. He can't get up and give an interview for all these people and say I am remorseful, I am so sorry. The few times he did, he was told not to say anything, by myself, certainly, and by various courts along the way. He's a criminal defendant. He can't speak during the pendency.

I have spoken to him. I can tell you -- at least this I can tell you, is that he has always expressed remorse to me. He has always wanted to accept responsibility for this.

The defense in this case was not to excuse his actions. The defense in this case was defending the charge of murder, the unusual charge of murder,

People v. Heidgen

not unprecedented, but unusual, unprecedented here, certainly. That is what it was.

An individual who is convicted of manslaughter who has a .28 reading and kills another because of that drunk driving, the maximum sentence would be five to fifteen. That same act as a murder for the depraved indifference jumped the sentence from 15 to 25 to life. The minimum sentence on the murder charge for the same conduct and result is three times the maximum of the manslaughter, three times by virtue of that, from five to 15 to 15 to life.

certainly, Judge, I urge you that that three times the sentence of other similarly situated cases, whether it's a prosecuting attorney's decision in county to county to county -- that's another thing that maybe the legislature needs to deal with at some point. But there's such discretion now with using this depraved indifference, which the court of appeals is still grappling with what it really means, but if it can be used so indiscriminately from county to county to county, the same acts, three times the maximum sentence of the traditional charge of manslaughter is certainly a severe enough penalty, upgraded penalty, from what other people may be

People v. Heidgen charged with and convicted of.

THE COURT: Mr. LaMagna, forgive me. My court reporters have been working for an hour and a half now. I am not curtailing you in any way, if you intend to finish.

MR. LAMAGNA: Three minutes?

THE COURT: okav. Go ahead.

MR. LAMAGNA: Judge., I urge you to consider the truth, the manner in which he lived his life before this. None of us in this courtroom, including your Honor, knows him. Those hundred people know him and that should speak volumes. It should, at least — it certainly is relevant to the man who stands before you, and 15 to life, given these circumstances, I believe, is just.

Judge, there is one letter, and I will conclude, that I submitted by an attorney who was Martin's friend's dad who I think encapsulates pretty much what I wanted to say, so if I may conclude with that:

As an adult who has known martin Heidgen for most of his life and seen him grow up literally in front of my eyes, I want to express to you my observations in regards to the question of who is Marty Heidgen.

People v. Heidgen

I'm not going to read the whole letter.

Marty has always been a well rounded all-American boy, much as my son, Joseph, and the sons of most average American families you can imagine. He has always been fun loving, outgoing, witty and a pleasure to be around. My wife and I have always found Marty to be respectful and well mannered. I have never known him to exhibit any unduly aggressive or hostile behavior. He is truly your typical American boy.

He and Joseph can sit for hours talking about sports and their plans for the future. Marty has always expressed a desire to pursue a meaningful career and his goal is to attend law school. He and Joe were both in the marine Corp., ROTC at catholic high school and Marty was on the soccer team.

 $_{
m I}$ often saw Marty at the Little Rock Athletic club when I went there to work out and he was employed there in the area where adults left their children to play while they worked. He seems to have a real rapport with the kids.

I am not trying to say that Marty is a perfect person, none of us are. what I am saying is that Marty is like most other young -- like most any other young person who you would be proud to call

People v. Heidgen

your son.

From years of knowing Marty and observing his behavior and character, I know that he would not intentionally bring harm to anyone and that the accident in New York would leave him unbelievably distraught and anguished for the families involved, including his own.

Marty is not a bad person. Marty is a good person. He is the same good person today that he was the date of the incident. He made a mistake which unfortunately resulted in terrible consequences.

Many of us have sons and daughters who have made similar mistakes. But for the grace of God, we could have been sitting in the position that Marty is today.

I don't write this letter to excuse Marty's actions or to minimize the consequences of his actions which leave us all grief stricken for the families involved. Rather, I am writing to let you know that Marty is, like most of us, a caring, well intentioned, level human being and not a monster, which, by human nature is a reflective conclusion others understandably might jump to given the magnitude of this tragedy.

I think that says it.

People v.Heidgen

The only thing, Judge, that I will leave you with, that I do disagree with, unfortunately, like. everybody else who is involved in this trial, Marty is not the same person he was before this accident, just like many of us, certainly the Flynn family, the Rabinowitz family and the Tangney family. The person you observed under the stress of this cavalcade of media is not the same 23 year old kid that's in those letters.

I would ask you to bear that in mind in arriving at any just sentence and I trust and I have all the confidence that you will. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. LaMagna.

we'll take a ten minute break.

(whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

MR. MARTELLO: Your Honor, may I proceed?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

MR. MARTELLO: Your Honor, first of all thank you very much for affording me the opportunity to address.the Court. I know the time is late and I am going to reduce my.prepared remarks accordingly.

I know a lot has been said here, Judge.

Judge, you heard from a lot of people here today and you heard a lot of opinions about who Marty

is, what he's done and how he should be punished.

People v. Heidgen

The great thing about this country is that everyone does have a right to an opinion and a right for their opinion to be heard. It was a vital part of this process in this sentencing hearing for you to hear all these opinions.

Likewise, Judge, another great thing about this country is that the law protects an individual sitting in a courtroom from opinions. The law is above those opinions. The law treats everyone equally and does not allow itself to be pressured by the opinion of the public or the government or even the media.

This courtroom, Judge, is the one safe haven for Marty Heidgen to be viewed fairly as to what he did and only what he did, regardless of what the public opinion is.

Judge, as you know, public opinion can. cut both ways. There have been cases where the public is more lenient toward the defendant and they come here to Court to ask for a less harsh sentence for a defendant that is similarly situated. Then there are times when the public opinion feels that the defendant should be more harshly treated.

In both instances, the public opinion is not really the relevant thing here. The law is what must

People v.Heidgen

control. In our country the law guarantees that every citizen will be consistently judged as all other citizens in a similar situation are judged.

Judge, I don't have to remind this Court, because I know what type of judge you are, that you are above the fray of public opinion, and only because the court is above that fray of public opinion can Marty be judged just for what he did.

Now, you know, Judge, when Mr. LaMagna and I took this case, we knew it was a very unpopular case. You know, we understood from the very beginning who the victims are. It's clearly the Tangney, Rabinowitz and Flynn families. we are never saying that Marty here is a victim, but even a person accused of what he has been accused of deserves a defense.

Though our heart goes out to the families, we have to keep asking yourselves, just like
Miss Tangney asked, why has this case received so much attention.

Mr. LaMagna alluded to the fact of the Staten Island Ferry case, the case of Karen Fisher where a priest was killed. In all those instances, families were destroyed, but yet there has not been this focus on those cases to have a certain result.

21.

People v. Heidgen

The district attorneys in those cases have made much less recommendations in their sentence, and, like, Miss Tangney, we had to ask the question why, what was it about this case.

It's almost as if the collective anger of all of society over the last 30 years, of all the senseless tragedies on the roads that have occurred at the hands of drunk drivers, have been visited on Marty Heidgen. It's almost as if he has become a flash point, a poster child, if you will, for all the sins of other drunk drivers of the last 30-plus years. He has almost become a poster child of what's wrong with the laws today and, frankly, Judge, that's wrong.

As you know, Judge, he's not supposed to pay for what's happened 30 years ago. He's only supposed to pay for what he did and for who he is. If the laws are to be changed, there's another venue for that. Here, as we sit here today, we are judging Marty Heidgen just for his acts on July 2nd, 2005, and not for all that has gone on on the streets and on the highways over the 30-plus years.

Now, Judge, you know -- and again -- I know I am pressed for time.

THE COURT: You're not pressed for time.

People N. Heidgen

MR. MARTELLO: All right. Thank you, Judge.

Judge, I want to tell you, and I'm not pandering to you by saying this, but I've gotten to know you quite well over the last couple of months and I know your representation and, again, please don't accept this as pandering, but you are a good man. You're a moral man. I see it in your actions and in your words. I haven't always agreed with your rulings here in court, but I always knew whatever your rulings were, they were from the heart and they were what you believed to be right.

Sometimes justice, an and act of justice, requires us to do unpopular things, and you have ruled and made unpopular rulings just simply because they were right.

I am going to ask you today to make what may be an unpopular ruling, but as I alluded to you before, we, as the guardians of the law, chiefly you, Judge, we have to be above the fray of what the public may want, whether they want a harsher sentence or lighter sentence.

Now, I'm not asking you, Judge, to affix a sentence to Marty because it's what \mathbf{I} want or what the families want or the government or the media. \mathbf{I} am asking you because it's right. If the truth be

People v. Heidgen

told, Marty's family, if they were to have their way, if they were to get what they really they want, they would ask you to return Marty to the bosom of their home, to the safety of their home. That would be their opinion because they are his parents.

But that opinion isn't necessarily right. I understand it, but it's not necessarily right. He must be punished for what he did, but that's an opinion that the courts must be above, that fray.

Likewise, the victims' families, they are completely justified in their feelings, but there is no measure of punishment that could he exacted here in this courtroom today that would be sufficient for the victims' families. Now, that's their opinion.

Again, just because it's their opinions does not make it right.

Lastly, I come to the district attorney.

Now, the government is asking -- making a recommendation of 25 years to life. Again, that's their opinion, and they have a right to it, to that recommendation. But just because it's their opinion, again, does not make it right. I need you, Judge, to see through that.

The district attorney is, as you know, is a very important arm of the government. They are the

People v. Heidgen

prosecuting arm of the government. By virtue of the social conduct we have here in society, we entrust in the DA's office to employ the proper discretion in making recommendations upon a defendant.

we, as citizens of this county, put our lives in the hands of the DA by asking them to use their discretion when we, as citizens, do something wrong. When we do something wrong, we ask the DA, judge us fairly, to use your discretion.

I submit to you here, Judge, that the district attorney's recommendation is inappropriate.

I believe that they did not properly use their discretion here.

They -- and I understand the DA has to speak for the victim, but they too must use their discretion and be able to distinguish between the actions of one defendant versus the actions of another defendant.

The DA has asked for 25 years to life,

Judge. That is the maximum sentence allowable in New

York state, the maximum. Now,. it seems to me that

the maximum sentence should be reserved just for the

most heinous members of our society, the most evil,

because you can't give any greater of a sentence.

so when they recommend to you, your Honor,

. 17

People v. Heidgen

25 years to life for this 25 year old young man, who has this terrible tragedy, but we must keep in mind it was borne from drinking, from a terrible mistake in judgment, they are asking for 25 years to life for him.

I asked the district attorney in a rhetorical sense, what would be reserved, what would they ask for in the most heinous, the most evil in society.

Clearly, despite the terrible, terrible tragedy that has occurred here because of Marty's actions, I don't believe anyone in this courtroom could possibly say he is the most evil we have in society, that he is the most heinous we have in society.

Suppose there was a contract killer here before this court and the district attorney had to make a recommendation, a contract killer accused of putting a gun to somebody's head and being paid a hundred thousand dollars to do it, more evil, more heinous than that.

A gang member that slit someone's throat just because that's the initiation right to get into the gang. That person -- could you get any more deprayed than that, any more evil.

21.

People v. Heidgen

The rapist and the murderer, or the mugger that lies in wait in an alleyway, doesn't know how much money you have in your pocket. You could have a couple hundred dollars or \$10,000, but he will kill you just the same for that money in your wallet, any more deprayed than that person.

But yet, the only recommendation, the only sentence that could be given to those most heinous, evil people is 25 years to life. I suggest to you, judge, that it is the obligation of us, as officers of the court, to do our best to use our discretion, to distinguish between those most evil and those that have done a terrible thing, nonetheless, and must be punished.

Don't mistake what I am saying, Judge. I know Marty must be punished and he must be punished significantly. A terrible tragedy has occurred as a result of his actions. But, regardless of how terrible this tragedy is, there have been people in our society that are so — that are evil and purely heinous, that that maximum charge should be reserved for.

Judge, as I said -- and I disagree with the $\mathit{DA's}$ recommendation but, fortunately, in this country, they are not the last word. You are the

People v. Heidgen

last word, Judge. You know, both physically and symbolically, you sit higher than everyone here, and there is avery good reason for that, Judge, because you are empowered with the very tough job to be wiser than all of us, to not give sway to public opinion, to not give sway to, let's say, an over reaching government. You are the final arbiter here in this sanctuary here, Judge. You are the last resort.

Judge, I know -- I know you. want to send a message here, Judge, and you absolutely should. But I'm just going to ask you, Judge, to send the right message. Don't send the message that he should be punished because of the collectively anger of all the sins and tragedies that have happened on the road at the hands of drunk drivers over the last 30 years. Don't sentence him to that as the public seems to want.

Don't sentence him by grouping him with the most heinous criminals, the most evil members of society, as the government wants you to group him in. Do not put him in with those people. Don't sentence him consistent with that.

Those are the wrong messages, Judge. I think the message that this court should send is that driving while intoxicated in this county, or anywhere

People v. Heidgen

in this state, will not be tolerated, and, if you do so, you are going to be punished and you are going to be punished severely, but you're going to be punished justly, consistent with other citizens in our society similarly situated regardless of what the rest of the public wants.

You're going to be punished as a person that has done a terrible thing as •a result of drinking, but you're not going to be punished consistent with the Jeffrey Dahmers of the world or the collin Fergusons of the world. You're not going to be judged as harshly as those most evil people in our society.

The maximum punishment must be reserved for those people, and, if it is not, then we are watering down the punishment we give to those most evil people in society, if we can give it to this young man here today.

Judge, I told you I would try to be brief. I think I have accomplished that, but I would like to leave you with this, Judge.

You know, this courtroom doesn't guarantee that justice is going to happen here today. There's no guarantees. These four walls, all it guarantees is that we have a chance to have justice here today.

People v. Heidgen

You have heard from so many people, now including myself, and I suspect the person you most want to hear from is Marty himself. But, Judge, you have heard from so many people, and you have heard so many opinions, please listen to that one concept of justice. That, to me, is the overriding concern here, not to let him off the hook. He must be punished significantly but he must be distinguished from the most evil in society. Please, allow this courtroom to have a chance for justice to happen.

I want to thank you, Judge, for allowing me to address you. It's been a pleasure to serve with you in your courtroom. I know now Marty wants to speak to you, and, with your permission, he would like to address the court.

THE COURT: Thank you.

THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon. There is really no easy way to begin this. I haven't had the opportunity to address all involved until now. I have been anxious though to say how I.felt since the beginning but I couldn't because of the circumstances. I have wanted to take responsibility for this, Judge, from the moment this happened.

It has been difficult to find words that express how I truly feel. Nevertheless, I am going

People v. Heidgen

to speak to everyone today from both my mind and my heart.

First and foremost, I am very sorry. I am very sorry every day, every hour and every minute, for the deaths of Katie Flynn and Stanley Rabinowitz and for the physical and emotional pain that you have suffered and will continue to suffer.

Even though words do not fully express the sorrow and emptiness that I feel now, nor can I imagine that I will always feel, your anger towards me is justified and understandable. I am most angry at myself, fudge.

I can also understand that you all are never going to forgive me. I am mean, nor did I intend for this to happen. I was just trying to go home. The reason this accident happened was because of my foolish and selfish decision to drink and drive. That is why this terrible accident happened and that is why good people died and good people were hurt. It was my responsibility to put-down my keys, that night. That is the biggest failure of my :life so far.

I also want to take this opportunity to address other young people in this community about drinking and driving and irresponsible social

People v. Heidgen

drinking. If you respect yourself and love others, do not drink and drive. It is deadly. Please, take it from me, all of us in this courtroom have lost because of my decision to drink and drive. Don't think that something like this can't happen to you. All of us here are proof that it can.

In. my opinion, blood alcohol limits should be 0.0 to properly reflect society's view on drinking and driving. That way there's no ambiguity or excuses. There are no opportunities to bend the rules.

I am also, fudge, a good person with warm feelings and compassion. I have shown that throughout my life by my actions. I have spent thousands of hours in my teenage and adult life working with children and needy members of the community. I have been a coach, a role model and a mentor for kids. I feel like I have let all those people down.

That time has been the most rewarding and special in my life. Being a part of building a child's self esteem and character is truly special. Empowering a child is an amazing skill that I have been blessed with and kids have changed for me in miraculous ways. They have taught me to never judge,

People v Heidgen

to love and to listen. There viewpoint is not politicized or polluted. They have a natural unconscious bias towards good. I am sure Katie was just like that.

I also have respect and admiration for the older citizens of society. My grandparents have taught me wisdom, compassion and a lot of love. These things are what makes the death of Stanley so hard for me to take. I would never harm a child or a man like him.

I hope that this court will give me the opportunity to grow after this experience and allow me to aid in the growth of the community.

I also want to say I am sorry to the good people of Long Island who welcomed me with open and loving arms when I moved here eight months before this accident. I betrayed the trust that you gave me.

This foolish and unintentional act does not define who I am and I ask the court and everyone here not to confuse the tragic events of July 2nd, 2005, with who I am. I am not a depraved person or a monster, nor have I ever been at any moment in my life. I am just a normal, kind and caring guy who had a great life before this accident.

People v. Heidgen

I am not saying good people should get a free pass when they break the law. $\it I$ think their whole lives should be considered.

I understand, Judge, the anger you must feel by listening to the events of that night and the testimony in this trial. Just know that I have already begun a life sentence of anguish, grief and heartache long before this sentence.

I have also heard the accounts that say I show no remorse. For people to write that I am unremorseful is very shocking to me. All I have is remorse, not for me, but for the souls of the deceased. My demeanor is a result of the shock of the events transpiring around me which still to this day seem very surreal. It is also a sign of my belief in God's plan. It's a comfort I have my parents and family. I have put my full faith in God that this is His plan.

once again, I want to say again how very sorry I am. I will always live with this. I am a person of faith and I pray that God gives you all the strength to deal, as much as possible, from all of this.

Now I want to offer Katie, Stanley, the Flynns, the Rabinowitzes, the Tangneys and you,

People v. Heidgen

Judge, my greatest gift, as defined in my life, the gift of love. Love defines who I am. Thank you, judge.

THE COURT: I am going to take a two-minute break to give the family an opportunity to come back in before I discuss the sentence.

(whereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

THE CLERK: Will the defendant, please, rise?

THE COURT: Mr. Heidgen, you have been present all day and heard how you have affected lives of those who have lived to experience and endure the pain that you have caused. Any attempt that I would make to discuss the enormity of their loss, both in terms of the lives lost due to your actions or the pain they endure on a daily basis, both physical and emotional, would pale in comparison to the heartbreak in the expressions that we have just heard.

As a judge of this court for the past ten years, it has been my duty to sentence many individuals who have intentionally taken lives from innocent people. But I have rarely been in a position to sentence one who has taken lives and affected so many because of pure blatant, callous and wanton disregard for the consequences of his actions

People v. Heidgen

and their affect on innocent victims.

while your pleas may sound genuine, you will remember that I have been privy to letters and phone calls made by you while in the Nassau county Correctional Center. The letters and phone calls speak volumes about who you are and where your true sympathies lie.

I was also privy to your attempt to falsify the DNA results ordered by this Court during your trial. That conduct speaks volumes about the callous disregard and contempt with which you view authority, law and the necessity for you to adhere to the rules of our society.

However, I will not punish you now for that act. That charge will have to be brought and proven beyond a reasonable doubt, like any allegation of a criminal nature. My sentence here today reflects only the sanction I believe you deserve for the charges of which you have been convicted.

The pleas of your attorneys, your family and yourself do not fall on totally deaf ears. I know that it is true that you didn't intend to take the lives of Stanley Rabinowitz or Katie Flynn and, while you didn't intend to cause devastating injuries to the Tangneys and the Flynns, through the course of

People v. Heidgen

the evidence presented, I am also aware that, unlike so many other defendants this court has sentenced, you have no prior criminal convictions.

However, it is also abundantly clear that you were aware of the risks that you took, both with respect to yourself and anyone unfortunate enough to cross your path on the night of duly 2nd, 2005, and you consciously chose to disregard those risks. That disregard goes to a level of culpability consistent with those who intentionally'take a life. This is why I will sentence you to a term whereby you may well spend the rest of your life in prison.

Before I do, I can only express this court's heartfelt condolences to the families that your actions have so deeply affected, the Rabinowitzes, the Flynns, the Tangneys, and your own family who had hoped so much for your life to take a different path.

The record should reflect I have before me a presentence report prepared by the probation department, reviewed by counsel, to which both sides have expressed their comments.

It is the judgment of this Court that for the crime of murder in the second degree, two counts thereof, each a class Al felony for which you stand convicted under counts one and two of

People v. Heidgen

Indictment 1910N-05, you, martin Heidgen, are hereby sentenced to two indeterminate terms of imprisonment each of which will have a range -- will have a maximum of life and a minimum of eighteen years

It is the further judgment of this court that for the crimes of assault in the first degree, three counts thereof, each a class B violent felony for which you also stand convicted under counts three, four and five of Indictment 1910N-05, you, Martin Heidgen, are also sentenced to three indeterminate terms of imprisonment, each for eighteen years, with five years of post-release supervision.

It is the further judgement of this court, for the crime of driving while intox cated, two counts thereof, each an unclassified misdemeanor for which you also stand convicted under counts eight and nine of Indictment 1910N-05, you, martin Heidgen, are hereby sentenced to two definite terms of imprisonment of 180 days and a fine of \$1,500.

In addition, your New York state driver's license or privileges to operate a motor vehicle in the state of New York are revoked for six months.

All of the terms of imprisonment just imposed will run concurrently.

People v. Heidgen Are there orders of protection here? 1 MS. MCCORMICK: There are not. 2 THE COURT: In addition, it is directed that 3 a DNA sample be taken. You are directed to pay 4 restitution in the amount of \$4,052 by civil 5 You are also assessed a mandatory 6 surcharge of \$250, DNA fee of \$50, DWI surcharge of 7 \$25 and a crime victim assistance fee of \$20, all 8 9 payable by civil judgment. it is further ordered that you are committed 10 to the New York state Department of corrections at 11 Fishkill, New York, to be dealt with there according 12 13 to law. 14 Certified to be a true and 15 accurate transcript. 16 17 18 /.)--2 · ^{\(\)},___<u>:</u> 1 19 BUFF BRAN'SON , RPR Senior Cou^rt Reporter 20 21 22 23 24 25